

# THE STUDENT WORLD

A quarterly magazine published at 13, Rue Calvin, Geneva,  
by the World's Student Christian Federation

J. R. MOTT, *Chairman*

HENRY-LOUIS HENRIOD,  
*General Secretary*

FRANCIS P. MILLER,  
*Administrative Secretary, Editor.*

MISS G. QUIN, *Associate Editor.*

---

VOLUME XXI

July 1928

NUMBER 3

---

## The Theme of the India Meeting.

It was decided a year ago that the theme for the discussions of the General Committee at its meeting in India next December would be "Christ in the Life of His Followers." The experience of Christ in life means very different things to different sections of the Church. It is not too much to say that it means a different thing to each individual. There is one Christ, but His Life flows out in countless channels and expresses itself in myriad ways. The glory of his living spirit is the countless variety of forms through which it reveals itself. It has been the intention of the editors to include in this number of the "Student World" a few representative statements which will illustrate this variety of the revelation of Christ in the thought of his followers. We do so because we believe that the cross-fertilization that results from exposing different points of view to each other is essential to the continuance of creative activity and spiritual productivity. All intellectual or religious schools of thought which pull down the blinds of their own windows and refuse to test the truth of their own partial doctrines by whatever light may exist outside themselves will inevitably end by becoming intellectually sterile and religiously decadent, however much virility they may display at the moment.

While it is perfectly true, as Dr. Barth points out in the letter he has been kind enough to allow the "Student World" to publish, that the totality of different points of view does not

equal the truth, it is equally true that any one given point of view will approach nearer the truth after exposure to the stimulating and invigorating contrasts that other points of view offer. The peril of syncretism is real, but the peril of segregation is equally real. The way lies somewhere between.

As far as the Western Church is concerned, the pride and arrogance which has led it to regard the segregation and defense of religious points of view as a greater virtue than their exposure and explanation is doubtless one of its real vices, and more than anything else prevents the development of the true consciousness of a world community among Christians. If the position that one holds is true, he can well afford to display it alongside of others in order that the Christian world as a whole may compare and profit by the comparison. The Federation conceives of itself as having the duty to encourage among its members a willingness to expose their own expression of faith to the corrective that comparison brings. It also has the duty to encourage each one to give the most complete and vital expression to his own particular faith that he possibly can, in order that each person may bring of his best to the City in which the honour and glory of the nations will be assembled.



# **Why Jesus Christ Commands My Allegiance.**

By W.B. SELBIE.

I understand that I am expected to give some kind of personal testimony as to the relations between myself and Jesus Christ, and the reasons which compel me to call Him Master and Lord. It is obvious that this can only be done with certain reservations. There are depths in the religious experience of most men that they can never reveal to others. And yet I agree that Christians are often too reticent, and that there is laid upon them a duty of witnessing for Christ which will inevitably involve a measure of personal confession.

## **A Manifestation of God.**

In attempting any such witness I would put first the fact that to me Jesus Christ has the religious value of God. I see God in Him, and think of God in terms of His life and mind. Jesus was surely unique in the expression which He gave to God's attitude and relationship to men, an expression conveyed not merely in His direct teaching, but in His whole life and demeanour. The recognition of this came to me as it has done to multitudes of others with all the force of a revelation. Time was when I was afraid of God. He stood to me for something hard, exacting and aloof. He seemed to make demands which I found it very difficult to meet. But Jesus Christ changed all that! When I first realised that God is like Him, and that His life as it were translated God in human terms, my religion took on an entirely new aspect. To know Jesus Christ as God manifest in the flesh is in itself an emancipation. Fear is cast out, slavery is turned into sonship, and the temple roof becomes the open sky. It is possible to think of God with that quiet confidence and entire freedom from anxiety which Jesus Himself knew, and which, once we can attain it, alters the whole perspective of life. I would not perhaps go so far as to say that the acknowledgment of God in Christ solves all problems "in the earth and out of it," but I certainly think that it lays a foundation on which we can safely build, or presents us with a key which we shall be wise to use. One of the astonishing and disappointing things about many types of Christianity is the evidence they give of a conception

of God and His requirements, which is Pagan rather than Christian. If God is Love and His attitude to us one of saving grace, then our response to Him should be one of boundless gratitude, obedience and faith. It is incredible that such a God should require of us to placate Him with fastings, orthodoxies and ritual. It is because Jesus Christ substituted for these things a spiritual sonship and a worship based on confidence and love that He presents to needy and penitent souls so irresistible an attraction.

### **A New Vision of Man.**

Closely bound up with the revelation of God in the life and teaching of Jesus was His new valuation of man. Much of the strength of His appeal lies in the fact that He knew what was in man and yet never despaired of him. He chose His disciples from very ordinary people and gave them credit for powers and capacities which they would never have claimed for themselves. Even sinners and outcasts were not beyond the pale of His regard. They might be lost for the time being, but in the mouth of Jesus the word lost always meant capable of being found. With Him, therefore, there is hope for the very worst of us, and the fact that He sees us not as we are but as we might be and may become, is another ground of our gratitude to and hope in Him. There is something singularly attractive in the attitude of Jesus to women and children, and in the broad and tender humanity of His relations with the sick and sorrowing. There is in Him an entire absence of that slightly superior air with which most good people approach the outsider and the unfortunate. And it is just here that He challenges us and claims our admiring allegiance. We all know that we ought to emulate His spirit of charity, and we also know how difficult it is. Yet it is so essentially right that we should see men and women with His eyes, and that we should be as slow to judge the evil and as quick to see the good in them as He was, that we cannot but recognise here a standard by which our Christianity will be rightly judged. That Jesus Christ has shown me the way to a truer estimate of my fellow men and to happier relations with them is not the least of His benefits.

### **A Passion for Goodness.**

Further, He has a most undoubted claim on my allegiance because of His moral supremacy. It is not merely that He is a conscience incarnate and that His teaching sets forth the highest



possible moral ideal. He is Himself the embodiment of that ideal and by His self-denying devotion to goodness, and the strength of His resistance to evil appeals to the best in us and stirs it to emulation. In His insistence on the inwardness of morality and on the supreme importance of intention and desire, He strikes a note so different from that of conventional ethics that it drives one to penitence and self-examination. The Christian character as Jesus envisages it is supremely attractive because it avoids the extremes of asceticism, Puritanism and Pharisaism, and reveals itself in poise, purity, simplicity and service. Jesus teaches that the end of all religion is goodness, and that it is by their fruits that Christians must be known. The goodness that He inculcates is not some cloistered or academic virtuosity, but a veritable passion, strong, eager, active and benevolent.

### **An Interpreter of Life.**

All this, however, is only part of that wider interpretation of life for which Jesus stood and still stands. It was said of Him that "He came that men might have life and that they might have it abundantly." His mission was to bring men here and now into touch with life eternal, and to help them to live in the only worthy sense of the term. So, again, He claims my allegiance because He is the Lord of all good life. As such, the great thing He does for us is to help us to "see life steadily and see it whole." He gives to men a sense of proportion and perspective, and so delivers them from dilletantism on the one hand, and fanaticism on the other. With Him the body is not the enemy of the soul but a means to its development, and He shows His followers how they may live in the world though they be not of it. That "man doth not live by bread alone," and that "a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things that he possesseth" is of the very essence of the teaching of Jesus. It is this suggestion of aims and interests far transcending those of this world that gives both direction and stability to the life of a Christian. It also meets a psychological need and delivers man from those earthly appetites which war against the soul. In the stress He lays on other-regarding impulses as over against one's native selfishness, and on the desires and intentions of the heart as over against the decencies of outward observance, Jesus gives an interpretation of life which becomes at once a challenge and an inspiration. It meets the needs of our higher nature by widening

our whole horizon and teaching us to look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen and eternal. It might be said of Him that while He lived in the present "the far future was His world always." He "brings life and immortality to light" not merely to redress the balance of things in this world, but rather to correct our perspective, and help us to live better and judge more justly by seeing all things *sub specie eternitatis*.

### The Living Christ.

But when all this has been said the question still remains, How is this ideal life to be attained? Who is sufficient for these things? It is quite true that if Jesus merely sets before men an ideal acknowledged to be high and almost unattainable, then His teaching must be regarded as little more than a counsel of despair. It is not difficult to realise its truth and greatness. Men are not slow to admire it, and even to see in the call to follow it an obvious duty. They know what they ought to do, the question is how to do it? Now it is just here that Jesus Christ seems to me to become something more than an ideal and an example. He is a power as well as a pattern, and He claims allegiance because He is able to give men the strength to attain the heights to which he points them. What is sometimes called the doctrine of the Living Christ presents, no doubt, many difficulties, but the fact to which it witnesses has to be taken into account. The personality of Jesus Christ is a force to be reckoned with and works on other personalities in a way for which there is good psychological justification. We all know how profoundly we can be influenced by some person stronger and better than we are, even though our contacts are few and far between. So with Jesus Christ, if we seek to do His will, and think His thoughts, and share His ideals, in other words, if we follow Him, we find that, as of old, virtue goes out of Him into us, we are lifted out of ourselves and above our weaknesses, so that we can almost say with the Apostle Paul, "It is no longer I that live, but Christ that liveth in me." It is in this moral catharsis and renewal that the saving power of Jesus Christ has its perfect work, and He becomes to His followers not merely a memory but a personal and living force. The power of God unto salvation is mediated through Him in the quickness of conscience and the renewal of the springs of a higher life. While the



occasion of this is, no doubt, the appeal made by His personality as a whole, that appeal is focussed and intensified in the cross. Whatever theory of the Atonement they may hold, there is a sense in which all Christians share the experience of St. Paul expressed in the words "Who loved me and gave Himself up for me." Their whole attitude to Jesus Christ is coloured from the outset by an intense personal gratitude, and this gives point and direction to all their intercourse with Him. What He did is at least as important as what He was and is in determining our relation to Him and His power over us.

### **The Gospel Portrait.**

Now I am conscious that all this needs some further defence and even apology. To many people in these days New Testament criticism has rendered the view here indicated of the work and person of Jesus Christ very difficult if not impossible. In their eyes the picture is so blurred and the history so dubious that Jesus Christ becomes little more than an elusive and unsatisfying phantom. To me, however, this seems a very lame and impotent conclusion. I am thankful for all that modern scholarship has done in the elucidation of the New Testament and its problems. But when criticism has had its perfect work, enough remains for faith and love. I cannot understand how anyone with the smallest literary sense or psychological insight, can fail to discern behind the Synoptic writers and the Fourth Gospel a vivid and coherent portraiture of a person of transcendent genius and power. It may be doubted whether any literary artistry, however skilful, could have succeeded so well in conveying to the world so convincing and homogeneous a picture of a great personality as have those candid and unconscious witnesses the four evangelists. It needs but very little imagination to recognise here one who, though over the heads of His reporters, has yet been represented by them in His true colours.

### **The Source of Endless Life.**

But granted that this is so, have we not here merely an historical figure, and is it possible for men and women to-day, in any real sense, to come into communion with and be influenced by one who lived so long ago and in a world so different from ours? I have

already indicated the answer to this question. For every one who cares to make Jesus Christ "The Master light of all his seeing," and to call Him Master and Lord, He becomes a supreme and potent reality for moral and spiritual life. The history of the Church is one long witness to His power. In countless disciples He has been born again and become in them the source of an endless life. Though they have not seen Him, they love Him, and their love is turned into joy.

"Jesus, these eyes have never seen  
That radiant form of thine;  
The veil of sense hangs dark between  
Thy blessed face and mine.

Yea, tho' I have not seen and still  
Must rest in faith alone;  
I love thee, dearest Lord, and will  
Unseen but not unknown."



# The Truth of Orthodoxy.

By N. BERDIAEFF.

Western Christian thought knows little of Orthodoxy. It is generally only the outward and, above all, the negative sides of the Orthodox Church that are known. Its inner spiritual treasures are still hidden from the West. Orthodoxy has always been secluded; the spirit of proselytism was foreign to it; it did not strive to show the world its true face. For a long time the part occupied in the world by Orthodoxy was not of the same importance as that taken up by Catholicism and Protestantism. Orthodoxy did not play the same active part in history. It stood quite aloof from the passionate religious struggle which lasted through many centuries. Its life flowed peacefully on under the protection of great Empires (Byzantine, Russian), and it was thanks to the destructive processes of the world's history that it had accepted eternal truth. It is very characteristic for the religious type of Orthodoxy that it has never taken a sufficiently prominent part in actual life, or been sufficiently developed in the outward sphere. However, it was just because of this that the truths of Christian revelation were reflected in it in the least perverted aspect. Orthodoxy is that form of Christianity which in its veritable essence has been least of all touched by human history. There have been many historical sins in the Orthodox Church. These chiefly proceeded from the outward dependence of the Church on the state. But the teaching of the Church, its inner spiritual path, remained pure and unsullied. In contradiction to the Catholic Church, which is preeminently a Christianity of authority, a Church of *tradition*, the Orthodox Church never had one sole outward authoritative organisation. Its unshattered strength lay in its spiritual inner traditions, not in outward authority. Of all aspects of Christianity, Orthodoxy is the one which is most closely linked to that of primitive Christianity. Spiritual tradition gives the Church the strength of spiritual experience. The spiritual path trodden by others is received by it as a heritage. This strength of spiritual life stands much above our personal life. In it each generation oversteps the boundaries of self-satisfaction and isolation, and participates in the spiritual life of all the preceding generations. Ay, even in that of the Apostles. It seems as if we felt the heart-

beats of one and the same heart. Tradition brings down to me the same experience, the same revelation as those received by the apostles, the martyrs, the saints, the Fathers of the Church, the whole Christian world. In tradition my knowledge grows to be not only my own personal knowledge, but a knowledge outside and beyond my own personality. I live not only as a separate entity ; I live also in the Body of Christ ; I live in one organism with all my brethren in Christ. Orthodoxy is, first of all, the Orthodox conception of life. In the eyes of Orthodoxy the man whose spiritual life is false is the real heretic, not the man who professes false doctrine. Orthodoxy is, first of all, not a doctrine, not an outward organisation, not established rules of outward conduct, but *spiritual life*, spiritual experience, and a spiritual path. In the eyes of Orthodoxy the essence of Christianity lies in inner spiritual activity. Of all Christian denominations Orthodoxy is the one which has the fewest strictly established rules, (in the rational-logical and moral-juridical conception of the word), and which has the most spiritual conception of religion. And, strange to say, it has often been just this inner spiritual life of Orthodoxy which has caused its outward weakness. The outward failings and defects of Orthodoxy ; its passivity and the incompleteness with which it has been carried out in actual life have been obvious to all. But its spiritual life, its spiritual treasures have remained hidden and unseen. This is very characteristic for the spiritual type of the East and quite foreign to the Western one, which has always been active and has manifested itself in outward life. However, this very activity has often impoverished it spiritually. In the Eastern world the non-Christian life of India remains hidden from the outward eye and plays no active historical part. Here we can draw a certain analogy, even though the spiritual type of the Christian East is very different from the spiritual type of India. In contrast to the Catholic Church, no written records of holiness of the Orthodox world have come down to us ; it has remained hidden from the outward eye. This is the reason why it is so difficult for the outsider to judge of the spiritual life of Orthodoxy.

### Mystical — not Intellectual.

Orthodoxy has not passed through a century of scholastics ; it has only lived through patristic centuries. Up till the present day the Orthodox Church has reflected the teaching of the



Eastern Fathers of the Church. The West sees in this a symptom of a retrograde mentality ; the failing of creative impulse. However, this fact can be explained in quite another manner. In Orthodoxy Christianity was never built up into a rational system, as, thanks to Aristotle and the regeneration of Greek intellectualism, it was in the West, in Catholicism. In Orthodoxy doctrine never acquired such a binding importance and dogmas were not fettered with obligatory theological and philosophic explanations ; they were, first of all, understood as mystical facts. In the philosophic and theological exposition of dogma we were given much more freedom. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries the creative Orthodox thought of Russia tried to find an answer for the new historical problems which had not existed during the Byzantine empire. Much freedom and spiritual boldness were manifested in this search. The spiritual type of Orthodoxy is above all and from the very outset an ontological one. This ontologism is, first of all, manifested in Orthodox life, and only after that in Orthodox thought. The general tendency of the Christian West was to move along the lines of critical thought, along intellectual paths in which the subject stood in contrast to the object. Thus the organic wholeness of thought and its connection with life were destroyed. The strength of the West lies in the complexity and development of its mental life ; in its reflexive and critical spirit ; in its refined intellectuality ; in its mighty science. But along these paths the connection between knowledge and mental life on the one hand and the essential primary essence of existence and life on the other was broken. Knowledge was separated from life — thought from existence. Knowledge and thought were not actualised in the spiritual completeness of man, in the organic entity of all his powers. The West had achieved great conquests in this respect, but this caused the decomposition of the century - old ontological thought, and the thought of the West no longer touches the depth of existence. This has resulted in the scholastic intellectualism, rationalism, empiricism, subjective idealism, and pragmatism of Western mentality. But Orthodox thought remained true to its ontological nature ; it touched the veritable essence of existence. This manifested itself in the Russian religious, philosophic, and theological thought of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Orthodoxy has remained foreign to rationalism and to the legalistic spirit ; foreign to outward fixed rules. The Orthodox Church did not express itself in rationalistic ideas ; it can be comprehended only by those who live *in* it,

who are in communion with its spiritual experience. The mystical Body of Christ can be expressed by no intellectual definitions, there are no legalistic, no rational symptoms that can help to an understanding of it. True Orthodox theology is a theology of spiritual experience. There are almost no scholastic text-books in Orthodoxy. Orthodoxy is conscious of being a religion of the Holy Trinity; it is no abstract monotheism, but a concrete belief in a Tri-une God. And it is in spiritual life, in spiritual experience, and in the spiritual path that the life of the Holy Trinity is reflected. The Orthodox liturgy begins with the words: "Blessed be the Kingdom of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." It, so to say, begins service from above; from the conception of the Divine Trinity; not from the human soul, longing for and striving towards God. In the Orthodox temple we feel, first of all, that the Divine Trinity has come down to us, and not that man is striving up to God. The soul of Orthodoxy is not a "Gothic" soul. In Western Christianity the idea of the Trinity has occupied a less prominent place. It is the Personality of Christ that is the central figure there; it is also more anthropological. This difference had already become clearly defined at the time of the Eastern and Western Patriarchs. For the Fathers of the Eastern Church the starting point of theology was the Divine Trinity. The Fathers of the Western Church laid more stress on the human soul. Therefore the East preeminently revealed to us the mystery of the trinitarian and Christological dogma. The West, on the contrary, expounded in the first place the teaching of grace and of freedom and of the organisation of the Church. But there was great wealth and variety of thought in the West, and it was there that the human world was revealed to us.

### The Religion of the Spirit.

Orthodoxy is the form of Christianity in which the Holy Ghost has revealed Himself the most fully. This was the reason why the Orthodox Church did not accept the teaching of "Filioque;" for in it it saw a tendency to give a subordinate place to the teaching of the Holy Ghost. Dogmatic doctrine has revealed to us least fully the nature of the Holy Ghost. But the direct action of the Holy Ghost in the world is manifested very clearly to us, and it is most immanent in the world. The Holy Ghost acts directly in all creation and transforms created



beings. Some remarkable words of St. Seraphim, the greatest of Russian saints, regarding this have come down to us. Orthodoxy is not only trinitarian in its very essence ; its aim is not only the transfiguration of the life of the world according to the spirit of the Holy Trinity ; but it is, above all, transfigured by the presence of the Holy Ghost. Of course I am all the time speaking of the deep currents underlying Orthodoxy ; not of the superficial tendencies which are sometimes prevalent in it. This pre-eminence given to the teaching of the Holy Ghost, this expectation of a new outpouring of the Holy Ghost in the world, is most frequently developed on Orthodox ground. It is the remarkable peculiarity of Orthodoxy. Orthodoxy has often been more conservative and strictly traditional than either the Catholic or the Protestant teaching. But on the other hand, in its very depths, Orthodoxy always manifested a great expectation of a new religious spirit in the world ; of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost ; of the revelation of a New Jerusalem. For nearly a thousand years Orthodoxy did not develop historically ; evolution was foreign to it. But in its depths were hidden mysterious possibilities of religious strength, which were so to say stored up for a new, not yet existing, historical epoch. This was manifested in the Russian religious tendencies of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Orthodoxy more sharply than all other religions separates the Divine and the world of Nature ; the Kingdom of God and the Kingdom of Caesar. It does not admit of drawing an analogy between them as Catholic theology so often does.

Such a point of view, however, establishes no dualistic principles. On the contrary, it states that all the created world is transfused by Divine Energy. Divine Energy acts in man and in the world. We cannot say in speaking of creation that it is God, a part of God, or a manifestation of God. But we can also not say that it is outside the Divine. God and Divine life do not resemble the world of Nature. Here no analogy can be possible. God is without end. The life of Nature is strictly limited and finite. Yet Divine Energy is poured out into the World of Nature. This Energy reacts on it and brings light into it. This is what we understand when we speak of the action of the Holy Ghost. For Orthodox consciousness the teaching of Thomas Aquinas regarding the world of Nature, which he contrasts with the supernatural world, betokens a certain secularisation of the world. Orthodoxy is in its very essence a teaching of the Holy

Ghost. Therein lies its chief peculiarity. The teaching of the Holy Ghost is but the logical development of the trinitarian teaching. Grace is not the mediator between separate and opposed elements of the natural and the supernatural. Grace is the action of Divine Energy in creation; it is the presence of the Holy Ghost in the world. It is just this teaching of the Holy Ghost which renders Orthodoxy the least legalistic form of Christianity, *i.e.* here more than elsewhere we see the predominance of the principles of the New over those of the Old Testament. In its most exalted moments Orthodoxy understands the aim of life as the acquisition of the Grace of the Holy Ghost, as the spiritual transfiguration of created beings. This point of view differs in its very essence from the legalistic one in which the Divine and the super-human world sets down the law and the rules for the created world. Orthodoxy is, first of all, liturgical. It teaches and leads the people not so much by preaching to them and instructing them in the laws and rules of conduct, as by the direct liturgical rites, in which it gives examples of transfigured lives. It teaches the people by setting before them the examples of the saints; by encouraging the cult of holiness. But the examples of the saints do not follow any fixed rules, in them is rather manifested the enlightening Grace and the transfiguration of creation by the Holy Ghost. This type of Orthodoxy, which is limited by no fixed rules, does not fit easily into historical life, nor is it favourable to any kind of social organisation. The hidden mysteries of the action of the Holy Ghost in creation have not been actually manifested in historical life.

### The Individual and the Church.

The characteristic feature of Orthodoxy is *freedom*. This inner freedom may not be outwardly perceptible. But it transpires everywhere. The idea of freedom as the foundation of Orthodoxy was manifested in Russian religious thought during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The acceptance of freedom of conscience marks the difference between the Orthodox and the Catholic Church. Yet the Orthodox Church understands freedom in quite another sense than the Protestant. Protestantism and the whole of Western mentality have an individualistic conception of liberty. It is looked upon as the right of one individual to protect himself from the encroachments of other individuals; it leads to autonomy. But individualism is foreign to Orthodoxy.



Orthodoxy has its own peculiar spirit of collectivism. The religious personality and the religious collective body do not stand in contrast to each other ; their relations are not outward. Religious personality is an intrinsic part of the religious collective body, and the religious collective body is an intrinsic part of the religious personality. Therefore the religious collective body is not an outward authority for the religious personality, an authority that binds it from outside to a fixed teaching and to fixed laws of life. The Church is not something standing outside the religious personality of those who belong to the Church. Therefore the Church is not an authority ; it is a Grace-given unity of love and freedom. An authoritative spirit and individualism are both foreign to Orthodoxy, because both of them are the result of a rupture between the collective body of the Church and religious personality. There can be no spiritual life without freedom of conscience, without spiritual freedom. Without these you cannot abide in the Church, because the Church wants no slaves ; because God needs only free men. Yet veritable freedom of the religious conscience, spiritual freedom is manifested not in an isolated autonomic self-asserting personality, but in a personality which has become conscious that it is part of a super-personal unity, part of one spiritual organism, part of Christ's Body, *i.e.* part of the Church. My own conscience is not an outward part of the super-personal conscience. It is not contrasted with it. My own conscience reveals itself within the conscience of the Church. But without the active spiritual participation of my own conscience, of my own spiritual liberty, the life of the Church will not be realised ; the spirit of communion and fellowship will not exist. The life of the Church cannot remain something outward and outwardly binding for the individual. To be able to abide in the Church you must have spiritual freedom not only at the moment of entering it (this much is admitted even by the Catholics) but during the whole time that you are within the fold of the Church. All that is accomplished without spiritual freedom is un-spiritual, despotic, outward, conventional. The Catholic Church was always less subject to the state, but in Orthodoxy there was always more inner freedom. In Orthodoxy freedom is organically bound up with a *communion of Christian fellowship*, *i.e.* with the manifestation of the Holy Spirit within a religious collective body. This was the possession of the Church not only at the time of the Œcumenical Councils, but it abides in it for all times. In this communion of Christian fellowship in Orthodoxy consists the life of the

religious people. Yet it has no outward legal evidences ; it has only inward spiritual ones. Even an Œcumenical Council does not possess outward infallible authority. Infallible authority can be found only in the Church as a whole, within the whole course of its history, and all the members of the Church are the bearers and treasurers of this authority. The Œcumenical Councils possess authority not because they were assembled according to outward juridical legal competency, but because all the members of the Church accepted them as being Œcumenical and true. Only such a Council is true upon which the Holy Ghost has been poured out. But such a manifestation of the Holy Ghost has no outward juridical criteria. It is revealed to the Church by an inward spiritual testimony. All this shows that Christ's Church has no juridical, no fixed-rule character. At the same time our conception of the Church is the most ontological, because we see in the Church, first of all, not an organisation or an institution, but simply a society of the faithful, a real spiritual organism ; the mystical Body of Christ.

### The Transfiguration of Life.

Orthodoxy is more *cosmic* than Western Christianity. Neither in the Catholic nor in the Protestant Church was the cosmic nature of the Church, as the Body of Christ, sufficiently stressed. Western Christianity is very anthropological and social. But the Church is also a cosmos made Christlike. In it the whole created world is transfigured by the Holy Ghost. The advent of Christ — God and Man — is of cosmogonic importance ; it reveals to us, so to say, a new day of creation. Quite unknown to Orthodoxy is the juridical conception of Redemption, as the solving of a law-suit between God and man. Orthodoxy's understanding of it as the revelation of a new being, a new mankind, is more ontological, more cosmic. The central and leading idea of Eastern patristics was the idea of *deodis*, of the deification of man and of the created world. Salvation is the raising of man to a Divine level. And the whole of the created world, the whole cosmos, can be rendered Divine. Salvation is the enlightenment and the transfiguration of all created beings ; it is no juridical justification. Orthodoxy turns to the mystery of the *Resurrection*, to the apex, to the last aim of Christianity. Therefore the feast of Easter, the bright Resurrection of Christ, is the central moment of the life of the Orthodox Church. The bright rays of



Resurrection light up the whole Orthodox world. In the Orthodox cult the festival of Easter has an infinitely greater importance than in that of the Catholic Church. Here Christmas — the birth of Christ — occupies a more prominent place. In the Catholic Church we are chiefly made to see Christ crucified; in the Orthodox Church — Christ risen. The Cross is the path man has to tread, but this path leads us and the whole world to Resurrection. The mystery of the Cross has sometimes hidden from us the mystery of Resurrection. But the mystery of Resurrection is the final mystery of Orthodoxy. And the mystery of Resurrection is not only a mystery of mankind, but of the whole cosmos. The East, as a general rule, is more cosmic than the West. The West is very human. Therein lies its strength and significance and its limitations. On the spiritual soil of Orthodoxy the striving for universal salvation blossoms forth. We must seek salvation not individually, but in a communion of Christian fellowship, together with the whole world. In Orthodoxy we could never hear words similar to those of St. Thomas Aquinas, who said that to see the torments of sinners in hell would add to the bliss of the righteous in Paradise. Never also could the teaching of predestination, either in the conception of Calvin, or in that of St. Augustine, have sprung up on Orthodox soil. Most of the Fathers of the Eastern Church, beginning with Clement of Alexandria and ending with St. Maxim the Confessor, were adherents of the *apocatastesis*, i.e. of a universal regeneration and salvation. This is also very characteristic, if not for official theology, still for Russian creative mentality. Orthodox consciousness never was crushed by the idea of Divine Justice. Divine Love was never hidden by it. The final aim is not the justification of man from the standpoint of Divine Justice, but the transfiguration and deification of man and of the cosmos. The realisation of Christianity in life is a manifestation of a transfiguring spiritual strength which can conquer death. It is not the fulfilment of moral commandments; for such a fulfilment has no strength in itself. But such a realisation is possible only if you believe in the living risen Christ.

### The Eschatological Expectation.

And finally the most important feature of Orthodoxy is its *eschatology*. In the depths of Orthodoxy there was much of the eschatology of primitive Christianity; the expectation of the Second Advent of Christ, of the coming Resurrection. This

eschatology of Orthodoxy is seen in the comparatively slight clinging to this world and to earthly life ; it is seen in a striving after heaven and eternity, i.e. after the Kingdom of God. In Western Christianity the realisation of it along historical paths, the striving to bring order into our earthly life, to build up an organisation upon earth, often hid from human sight the eschatological mystery, the mystery of the Second Advent of Christ. But in Orthodoxy this great eschatological expectation has been kept intact, just because Orthodoxy has been much less historically active. The apocalyptic side of Christianity has been much less expressed in the Western conception. On the contrary, in the East, on Orthodox soil, and especially on the soil of Russian Orthodoxy, apocalyptic tendencies have been greatly developed, and the expectation of new outpourings of the Holy Ghost are very living. Orthodoxy is the most conservative form of Christianity ; the one in which tradition plays the greatest part, for it is here that the truth of Ancient Times has been preserved. But it is also in Orthodoxy that the possibility of the greatest religious renovations is hidden. This would, however, not be the renovation of human mentality and human culture. In this kind of renovation the West has always been particularly rich. But it would be the renewing of a religious transfiguration of life. It is peculiarly characteristic for Orthodoxy that life has remained an integral whole, notwithstanding the differentiation of culture. The soil of Orthodoxy has not produced such a great culture as the Catholic and the Protestant religions have. Perhaps this was the case because Orthodoxy was directed towards the Kingdom of God. This Kingdom could not be the result of gradual historical evolution, but of a mysterious transfiguration of the world. Not evolution, but transfiguration is characteristic of Orthodoxy. You cannot learn to know Orthodoxy by studying official theological treatises. You can only know it by knowing the life of the Church and the life of the members of the Church. Still less can it be expressed as an abstract idea. However, Orthodoxy should come forth from its secluded and isolated position ; it should realise its hidden spiritual wealth. Then only will it be of importance for the world. The belief in the exclusive spiritual significance of Orthodoxy, as the truest form of Christianity, ought not to call forth in us a feeling of self-satisfaction and a denial of the importance of Western Christianity. On the contrary, we ought to learn to know Western Christianity ; we ought to stand in close communion with it. And I believe we could learn much from it. We must strive



towards Christian unity. Orthodoxy can be a peculiarly favourable soil for such a union. Orthodoxy is the form of Christianity which has been least of all secularised, therefore it can give much to the Christian world. A Christianised world does not mean a worldly Christianity. Christianity cannot remain isolated from the world and from the movements that are taking place in it. It must reach down to the world, so that it may conquer the world. It must not be conquered by the world.

### Zusammenfassung.

Die orthodoxe Lehre ist im Westen nur wenig bekannt. Sie hat niemals die gleiche bedeutende Stellung in der Welt gehabt wie der Katholizismus oder Protestantismus. Sie ist weder in die grossen religiösen Streitfragen verflochten gewesen, noch hat sie einen Einfluss auf die grossen Geschehnisse gehabt, die zu dem Fortschritt der Geschichte wesentlich beigetragen haben; aber gerade darum hat sie in sich die Wahrheiten der Offenbarungen Christi am reinsten erhalten. Die Tradition ist ein bedeutender Faktor im Leben der orthodoxen Kirche, sie steht dem Urchristentum in gewisser Beziehung sehr nahe und besitzt gleichzeitig einen Schatz an geistigen Erfahrungen, kraft derer die einzelnen Glieder der Kirche in ihrem ganz persönlichen Leben teilhaben an dem Mysterium des Leibes Christi und an der Gemeinschaft der Gläubigen. Da in der orthodoxen Kirche nur wenig feststehende Regeln festgesetzt worden sind, hat sie auch nicht den Charakter einer wohlgedachten, vielleicht etwas starren Organisation, sondern ist voll inneren Lebens. Mit diesem absolut geistigen Charakter ist aber eine gewisse äussere Schwäche verbunden, eine gewisse Passivität, sodass ihre Lehren oft wenig Anwendung im tätigen Leben finden. Und gerade in dieser Hinsicht, besonders in dem Mangel an Aktivität ist sie immer im Gegensatz zu dem Westen östlich gewesen.

Ein Stadium voll Suchens nach intellektueller Formulierung, wie die westlichen Konfessionen dies z.B. unter den Scholastikern durchlebten, kennt die orthodoxe Kirche nicht. Nie lag ihr ein rationalistisches System zu Grunde, noch hat die griechische Philosophie eine besondere Einwirkung auf sie gehabt. Darum liegt ihr Hauptgewicht auch nicht, wie bei den christlichen Konfessionen des Westens, im Intellektuellen sondern im mystischen; dies hat zur Folge gehabt, dass ihre Dogmen weniger starr sind. Ihr Hauptinteresse lag immer in der Ontologie, in der Behandlung der wichtigsten Probleme des Daseins. Im Westen entfernte sich das intellektuelle und kritische Denken von diesen Grundproblemen und konzentrierte sich dafür mehr auf wissenschaftliche Entdeckungen, und so wurde die organische Ganzheit des Denkens und die Verbindung mit dem Leben zerstört, und der Intellektualismus, Rationalismus, Empirismus und Pragmatismus sind für die westliche Mentalität charakteristisch geworden.

Die orthodoxe Lehre ist in erster Linie die Lehre vom Heiligen Geist; ihr Ziel ist die Verklärung des weltlichen Lebens durch den Geist der Heiligen Dreieinigkeit, aber vor allem durch die Gegenwart des Heiligen Geistes. Die Erwartung einer erneuten Ausgiessung des Heiligen Geistes,

wie unter den Aposteln, ist nicht selten unter den Orthodoxen, aber dadurch birgt die orthodoxe Kirche auch viel mehr mystische Möglichkeiten einer religiösen Erneuerung in sich und dies besonders, weil sie konservativer und traditioneller als Katholizismus und Protestantismus ist.

Obgleich die orthodoxe Lehre eine scharfe Grenze zieht zwischen Gott und der Natur, zwischen dem himmlischen Reich und dem Caesars, kann man dies doch nicht als dualistisches Prinzip ansehen, sondern es liegt dem vielmehr der Glaube zu Grunde, dass die geschaffene Welt von göttlicher Kraft durchflutet wird; was ungefähr dasselbe ist, wie wenn wir vom Wirken des Heiligen Geistes sprechen.

Der Begriff des weltlichen und überweltlichen und der Gnade als Vermittlerin zwischen diesen beiden ganz verschiedenen Elementen, wie wir ihn bei dem Heiligen Thomas Aquinas finden, ist für die orthodoxe Auffassung zu streng und gesetzmässig. Man empfindet die Gnade viel mehr in der Auswirkung der göttlichen Kraft in der Schöpfung, und in der Ausströmung des Geistigen auf die erschaffenen Wesen. Gerade in dieser Vorausnahme der Grundanschauungen des Neuen Testaments vor denen des Alten hat die orthodoxe Lehre im Vergleich zu den übrigen christlichen Konfessionen weniger den Charakter der Gesetzmässigkeit in sich entwickelt. Sie ist mehr liturgisch als gesetzmässig, sie unterweist und leitet die Menschen nicht durch moralische Gesetze, sondern durch die Vorbilder verklärter Leben, durch das der Heiligen, und so findet die Heiligenverehrung einen Raum in ihr.

Das bezeichnendste Charakteristikum der Orthodoxie ist Freiheit; gerade darin unterscheidet sie sich wohl am meisten vom Katholizismus. Andererseits ist aber ihr Begriff der Freiheit ein ganz anderer wie wir ihn im Protestantismus finden, der zur Autonomie des Individuums führt, denn in der Orthodoxie sieht man das Individuum nur als Glied einer überpersönlichen Einheit an, als Glied eines geistigen Organismus, dem Leib Christi, d.h. der Kirche. Aber die Autorität der Kirche ist nicht etwas äusseres, etwas das ausserhalb des Individuum wäre; das Bewusstsein des Individuum offenbart sich in dem Bewusstsein der Kirche, und ohne es wäre das wahre Leben der Kirche unmöglich. Im Vergleich zur katholischen ist die orthodoxe Kirche immer in stärkerem Mass dem Staat untertan gewesen, aber in ihr hat es stets eine grössere geistige Freiheit gegeben.

Die Autorität der Kirche liegt nicht in Gesetzen sondern in der Gegenwart des Heiligen Geistes und diese kann keiner äusseren gesetzlichen Kritik unterliegen, sondern sie offenbart sich in einem inneren geistigen Zeugnis. Sogar ein oekumenisches Konzil hat keine absolute äussere Autorität, diese findet man allein in der Kirche als geschlossener Einheit, wie sich dies im Verlauf der Geschichte zeigt.

Die Orthodoxie ist ferner kosmischer als das Christentum des Westens, das einen anthropologischen und sozialen Charakter hat. In ihr wird die ganze Welt durch den Heiligen Geist umgewandelt. Dies hat eine starke Einwirkung auf ihre Auffassung von der Erlösung, die sie nicht als rechtmässige Rechtfertigung, als die Lösung einer Rechtsfrage zwischen Gott und Mensch ansieht, sondern vielmehr als die Offenbarung eines neuen Menschen. Durch die Seligsprechung wird der Mensch zu göttlicher Höhe erhoben. So liegt nach der Auffassung der orthodoxen Gläubigen der Höhepunkt des Christentums in der Auferstehung; Ostern ist das Hauptfest des ganzen Kirchenjahres. Während die katholische Kirche mit Nachdruck auf den Gekreuzigten hinweist, bedeutet der Auferstandene Christus für die orthodoxe Kirche viel mehr. Das Mysterium der Aufer-



stehung ist das letzte Geheimnis. Und vor allem ist der Gedanke der Seligsprechung des Universums in der orthodoxen Anschauung immer von grösster Bedeutung gewesen, sie betrifft nicht nur das Individuum sondern die ganze christliche Gemeinde. Die meisten Kirchenväter der östlichen Kirche haben die Lehre der Erneuerung und der Erlösung des Universums gepredigt, und dies ist noch heute, nicht nur für die Theologen, sondern für die ganze russische Mentalität charakteristisch. Die göttliche Liebe ist dem orthodoxen Empfinden immer näher gewesen als das göttliche Gericht.

Schliesslich finden wir in der Eschatologie ein wichtiges Element der Orthodoxie. Die Erwartung einer zweiten Wiederkehr Christi, einer neuen Auferstehung hat immer eine wichtige Rolle gespielt. Daher findet man im Vergleich zu westlichen Religionen ein verhältnismässig geringes Interesse und sich Klammern am irdischen Leben. Durch das Streben, das Reich Gottes schon hier auf Erden zu verwirklichen, hat der Westen den Blick für das eschatologische Mysterium verloren; die Orthodoxie, die weniger weltlich aktiv ist, hat sich diesen bewahrt. Sie sieht das Reich Gottes nicht in einer allmählichen irdischen Entwicklung sondern in einer geheimnisvollen Umgestaltung der Welt. Die Orthodoxie kann nur durch das Leben der Kirche und das ihrer Gläubigen sich offenbaren; kein Studium ihrer Theologie wird ihren wahren Charakter enthüllen. Doch muss sie ihre Abgeschlossenheit aufgeben und muss versuchen, in Kontakt mit dem westl. Christentum zu kommen und dies zu verstehen lernen. Und gerade in dem Bestreben nach einer christlichen Einigkeit kann die Orthodoxie eine wichtige Rolle spielen.

### Résumé.

L'Eglise orthodoxe est peu connue en Occident. Elle n'a jamais occupé dans le monde une place aussi importante que le Catholicisme ou le Protestantisme. Elle s'est tenue à l'écart des grandes controverses religieuses et du cours général du progrès historique, mais, par cette raison même, elle a conservé, dans leur forme la plus pure, les vérités de la révélation chrétienne. L'Eglise Orthodoxe est avant tout une Eglise de tradition; elle reste étroitement attachée au Christianisme primitif et elle est la gardienne d'un trésor d'expérience spirituelle, en vertu duquel la vie individuelle de ses membres participe du Corps mystique du Christ, la communion des fidèles. L'importance de l'Eglise Orthodoxe réside moins dans son organisation extérieure que dans sa vie et son expérience spirituelles; elle a peu de règles fixes. Ce caractère nettement spirituel a eu, comme contre-partie, une certaine faiblesse extérieure, une passivité qui a rendu l'Eglise Orthodoxe incapable d'exprimer dans la vie active le contenu de ses enseignements. En ceci, comme par son indifférence à l'action, elle s'est montrée plus orientale qu'occidentale.

L'Orthodoxie n'a jamais traversé une période de définition intellectuelle, comme l'a fait l'Eglise d'Occident à l'époque de la théologie scolastique; elle n'a jamais été édifiée en un système rationnel construit selon les catégories de la philosophie grecque. Elle est donc moins intellectuelle et plus mystique que le Christianisme occidental; ses dogmes sont moins rigides. Ses préoccupations principales ont toujours été d'ordre ontologique, son intérêt s'est toujours concentré sur les problèmes essentiels de l'existence. En Occident, au contraire, la pensée intellectuelle et critique

s'est peu à peu écartée de ces problèmes fondamentaux pour s'attacher aux découvertes scientifiques, au détriment de l'unité organique de la pensée et de ses relations avec la vie. De là sont nés l'intellectualisme, le rationalisme, l'empirisme et le pragmatisme qui caractérisent la mentalité occidentale.

La religion orthodoxe est avant tout la religion du Saint-Esprit ; son but est de transfigurer la vie du monde selon l'esprit de la Sainte Trinité, et surtout par la présence du Saint-Esprit. Il est souvent fait allusion dans l'Eglise orthodoxe à l'attente d'une nouvelle diffusion du Saint-Esprit dans le monde ; c'est pourquoi la religion orthodoxe, quoique plus conservatrice et plus strictement traditionnelle que le catholicisme et le protestantisme, a toujours conservé de mystérieuses possibilités de renouvellement religieux.

Si la religion orthodoxe fait très nettement la distinction entre la Divinité et la Nature, entre le Royaume de Dieu et le Royaume de César, cela n'implique aucun système dualiste, mais au contraire la croyance à la transfusion de l'Energie Divine dans toute la création ; c'est ce que nous entendons quand nous parlons de l'action du Saint-Esprit. La conception du naturel et du surnaturel et de la Grâce médiatrice entre ces éléments différents et opposés, telle qu'on la rencontre chez Saint Thomas d'Aquin, semble trop rigide et trop légaliste à l'Eglise orthodoxe. Elle considère plutôt la Grâce comme l'action de l'Energie Divine en œuvre dans la nature, comme la transfiguration spirituelle des créatures. C'est cette prédominance des principes du Nouveau Testament sur ceux de l'Ancien Testament qui fait de la religion orthodoxe la forme la moins légaliste du Christianisme. Elle est plus liturgique que juridique, guidant et instruisant les hommes moins par des règles morales qu'en leur montrant l'exemple de vies transfigurées, les vies des Saints, et en encourageant le culte de la sainteté.

Le trait caractéristique de la religion orthodoxe est la liberté ; c'est par là qu'elle se distingue le plus nettement du catholicisme. D'autre part, sa conception de la liberté n'est pas celle du protestantisme, qui conduit à l'autonomie individuelle ; la religion orthodoxe considère plutôt l'individu comme faisant partie d'un tout collectif, d'un organisme spirituel, le Corps du Christ, qui est l'Eglise. Mais l'autorité de l'Eglise n'est pas quelque chose qui s'impose du dehors, restant extérieur à l'individu ; la conscience individuelle se révèle dans la conscience même de l'Eglise, dont la vie sans cela serait impossible. Bien que l'Eglise orthodoxe ait toujours été plus assujettie à l'Etat que l'Eglise catholique, elle jouit cependant d'une plus grande liberté intérieure. Son autorité n'a pas de base légale ; elle est fondée sur la manifestation en elle de l'Esprit Saint qui ne peut être soumise à aucun critère juridique extérieur ; elle se révèle par un témoignage spirituel intérieur. Un Conseil œcuménique lui-même ne possède pas d'autorité infaillible extérieure ; celle-ci n'appartient qu'à l'Eglise dans son ensemble et considérée dans le cours entier de sa vie historique.

La religion orthodoxe est plus cosmique que le Christianisme occidental, qui a un caractère anthropologique et social. Dans la religion orthodoxe, la création entière est transfigurée par le Saint-Esprit. Ceci influe sur sa conception de la Rédemption, qu'elle ne considère pas comme une justification juridique, comme le règlement d'un procès entre Dieu et les hommes, mais plutôt comme la révélation d'un nouveau mode de l'être, d'une nouvelle humanité. Le Salut, c'est l'élévation de l'homme à un niveau divin. Et la Résurrection devient aussi dans l'Orthodoxie le



moment culminant du Christianisme, et la fête de Pâques est la fête centrale de l'année. Tandis que l'Eglise catholique romaine s'attache à présenter le Christ crucifié, l'Eglise orthodoxe présente de préférence le Christ ressuscité. Le mystère de la Résurrection est l'ultime mystère. C'est surtout dans l'Eglise orthodoxe que l'idée du salut universel a prévalu. Le salut n'est pas seulement individuel, il est commun à tous les Chrétiens ; la plupart des Pères de l'Eglise d'Orient ont proclamé la doctrine de la régénération et du salut universel et c'est ce qui caractérise non seulement la théologie officielle, mais la mentalité russe tout entière. L'Amour Divin a toujours été plus présent à la conscience orthodoxe que la Justice Divine.

Enfin, l'un des éléments essentiels de la religion orthodoxe est son eschatologie. L'attente d'une seconde venue du Christ et d'une future résurrection y a toujours joué un rôle important. De là, en comparaison avec le Christianisme occidental, son peu d'attachement et d'intérêt pour la vie terrestre. Dans son effort pour réaliser le Royaume de Dieu sur la terre, l'Occident tend à perdre de vue le mystère eschatologique ; l'Orthodoxie, moins active dans l'histoire, a su préserver cette valeur. Elle voit, dans le Royaume du Ciel, non le résultat d'une évolution historique progressive, mais une mystérieuse transfiguration du monde. L'Orthodoxie ne peut être vraiment connue que par la vie de son Eglise et par celle de ses membres ; aucune étude de sa théologie ne révélera son véritable caractère. Mais l'Orthodoxie devra perdre quelque chose de son exclusivisme ; elle devra entrer en contact avec le Christianisme occidental et apprendre à l'apprécier. L'Eglise orthodoxe peut avoir un rôle important à jouer dans le mouvement qui tend vers l'unité chrétienne.

# Christ in the Catholic Church.

By M. D. PETRE.

The purpose of this article is, of course, in no sense controversial ; such a purpose would be as unsuited to the organ of the Student Christian Movement as it is innately uncongenial to the mind of the writer. Its object is expressed in the words of the title ; it is an endeavour to indicate what are the characteristics of faith in Christ as shown in the doctrine, the worship, the prayer, the practice of the Roman Catholic Church.

Every Christian body is necessarily inspired by some form of faith in Christ, but the characteristics of that faith are susceptible of considerable variety. What, then, may we regard as the special contribution of the Catholic Church to the general faith of humanity in Christ ? In what manner has she preserved His memory and perpetuated His life ? How far has she proved herself the great custodian of belief in Christ and conformity to His word and example ?

## The Two Tables.

In one of the last chapters of the "Imitation of Christ," in the Book that is devoted to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, we read the following words :

"Whilst I am detained in the prison of the body, I acknowledge myself to stand in need of two things, namely, food and light. Unto me then, thus weak and helpless, Thou hast given Thy Sacred Body, for the refreshment both of my soul and body, and Thy word Thou hast set as a light to my feet..... These also may be called the two Tables.... One Table is that of the Sacred Altar, having the holy bread, that is the precious Body of Christ ; the other is that of the Divine Law, containing holy doctrine, teaching men the right faith, and strongly conducting them forward even to within the veil, where is the Holy of Holies."

To no Christian Body is either of these Tables wholly lacking, yet in some Christian communities, of the more definitely Protestant and Evangelical type, the Table of the Word possesses so great a pre-eminence as almost to obscure the Table of the Altar.

Now it is, I would maintain, above all in virtue of her sacra-

mental system that the Catholic Church has preserved the life of Christ in the souls of mankind, though not in virtue of that alone. Christ has been for her the living centre of religious life, the living object of prayer and worship, and this He has been to her by reason of her belief in His Divinity, and her belief in his abiding presence and action by means of her sacramental system. These are her two Tables ; the Table of Doctrine, on which are engraved the words that " Christ is God ; " the table of the Eucharist, on which He is adored as present to the souls of His worshippers ; present for them, present in them, God and Man.

### Commemoration — or Communion ?

Some of my readers may remember a novel that caused considerable stir in the last years of the nineteenth century — " Robert Elsemere " by Mrs. Humphrey Ward. In that story the man who has passed from belief in the Divinity of Christ to a respectful recognition of His great, but long past, action and influence, teaches his followers to make constant commemoration of Him — " This do in remembrance of me, " and the response is " Jesus, we remember Thee always. "

Remembrance — commemoration. We remember Caesar and Bonaparte ; Socrates and Augustine ; we remember the great liberators of mankind, the great philanthropists, the great religious leaders of humanity. Their deeds may still inspire us ; their words may still be with us ; but they themselves ? Can we say that they are there ? Are they present ? Are they living ? (I mean living here and now and with us ; not living another life which we do not yet enjoy).

The most loving veneration of the dead is lacking in actuality save in so far as we feel them yet living and present ; it is a burning desire for their actual presence which inspires the passionate efforts of Spiritualism.

We cannot communicate with a simple memory ; nor can we adore a man, however holy, who is now dead. Hence Christianity becomes a ghostly religion, or merely an ethical code, unless it be inspired throughout by faith in the living presence of Christ ; and can such belief in His presence exist, or be maintained, without belief in His Divinity ? The adoration of a memory is lacking in reality save in so far as that memory presents to us something yet living and divine. It is here that the religion of Positivism has ever seemed to me to fall short of the essential



requirements of religious life and worship ; it is a worship of the past, and not of the living present.

It may be urged that the doctrine of the Communion of Saints introduces the worship of beings holy but not divine. But, without going into a theological examination of this doctrine, it may be said at once that no worship of saints implies faith in their omnipresence nor their actual presence to the mind and soul of the worshipper ; it is in and through God that we know them and they know us. We may be, we probably are, working towards a fuller conception of the unity of life, of the inter-connection of souls ; and such a more developed conception may, eventually, greatly enlarge our understanding of the doctrine of the communion of saints. None the less is such worship distinguishable from the direct worship of God as omnipresent and actually present, to the soul of the worshipper ; and only in virtue of the belief in Christ as divine can He be to us a living object of adoration, a direct object of address.

### **The Sacramental System.**

To return, then, to a definite consideration of the subject of this article, and to the theme that was originally proposed to me — I was asked to say, as well as I could, what “a Catholic really finds in his Church as regards her power of bringing closer to him the central figure of Christianity.”

I should reply that she has distinguished herself by the persistent maintenance of those two Tables of which we have spoken — the Table of the Word — the Table of the Altar, but that her peculiar distinction has consisted in the maintenance of the Table of the Altar, and that it has been, above all, by her Eucharistic doctrine that she has preserved the living value of Christ, and His presence in the hearts of the faithful.

This living belief in Christ can be, has indeed been preserved with a much less vigorous sacramental system ; we have examples of it in other Churches, and in other religious bodies that do not term themselves Churches.

We have those to whom Christ is vividly present in virtue of His Gospel. We have the shining examples of men like Bunyan, like Wesley ; and we have the existing Nonconformist bodies with their insistence on the doctrine of the atonement, and yet their repudiation of what Roman Catholics most treasure in the sacramental system. They have succeeded in their own way ;

but the chief way of Catholicism has been by means of her sacraments ; through them it is that she has maintained the century long daily intercourse of the soul with Christ.

All Churches have a sacramental system, but the Catholic conception of sacraments is surely distinct from the others ; and above all is the Catholic conception of the Eucharist different in doctrine and usage from that of other Churches.

To put it in a few words, it is the doctrine of the Real Presence that has shaped and inspired the religious attitude of Catholicism in regard to Christ.

This article, as I have said, is not controversial, and I am not out to define or prove the doctrine of the Real Presence, but what I want to show is the distinctive quality of the relation of the human soul to Christ which springs from the Catholic teaching on this point. What I am trying to indicate is the profound difference between a cult of commemoration and a cult of adoration and direct communion. " Do this in remembrance of Me ; " those words may be taken in a purely commemorative sense. But for the Catholic Church they are not purely commemorative, but are the sequel of those other words " This is my Body — this is my Blood, " in which she calls down the living presence of Christ upon the Altar before summoning the faithful to partake of that presence.

The Catholic is not satisfied with the remembrance of Christ, he must worship Him ; he is not satisfied with talking of Him, he must speak to Him.

If large sections of other Churches have, of late, come once more closer to the teaching and practice of the Catholic Church, it is, I believe, to a great extent her Eucharistic doctrine that has drawn them. They have sought the living presence of Christ, as in the doctrine of His Divinity, so in that of His real presence in the sacraments ; they have hungered for Christ, the Bread of Life.

### **The Mission of the Catholic Church.**

The Roman Catholic Church has alas ! proved hard and inaccessible ; she has been as intransigent in regard to science and criticism as she has been ruthlessly exclusive in her treatment of other religious bodies. She has been the great preserver of the life and teaching of Christ, but she has regarded Him too much as her special possession ; she has been tenacious of theological positions, over-protective in her care for her children ;

over-insistent on the letter, not sufficiently confident in the spirit. These faults are to be set against her claim to gratitude for her fidelity to her Master and her faithful preservation of the sacramental system.

But she, who has been the most intransigent in her treatment of modern thought, could actually have afforded to be the least so ; because, according to her true teaching, the past is secondary to the present, and history to spiritual reality.

As Father Tyrrell wrote, shortly before his death :

" Apart from isolated tests, there was the broad fact that Jesus seemed to call men less to His teaching than to Himself as the embodiment of the life and truth that he taught ; that He made personal love and devotion to Himself the equivalent to salvation and the righteousness it involves. This was implicitly to take God's place in relation to the soul — the place which Jesus has actually taken for Christians — a place which no other religious teacher, neither Moses, nor the Buddha, nor Mahomet has ever claimed or received <sup>1</sup>...

" Criticism can tell against the monophysite Christ, that so many soi-disant orthodox are defending, or against certain deductions *ex congruo* of Athanasian Christology, but against the substance of that Christology it can do nothing " <sup>2</sup>.

For her lack of trust in the inevitable achievements of human thought ; for her lack of comprehension and charity in regard to other religious bodies, the Roman Catholic Church has suffered in herself as in some of the noblest of her children, and she has suffered in her mission to mankind. None the less does the great fact remain that she has been, by means of her sacramental system, the great preserver of the life of Christ in the human soul, and that other churches owe much to her fidelity.

At the foot of her altars, in front of her sacred tables, the soul has breathed forth acts of love and abandonment that " the tongue cannot utter ; " has apprehended truths that " the letter cannot express ; " has partaken of such fulness of life and joy as is only known to those who have experienced what it is to love Jesus.

Nec lingua valet dicere,  
Nec litera exprimere  
Expertus potest credere,  
Quid sit Jesum diligere.

---

<sup>1</sup> (Hibbert Supplement, 1909)

<sup>2</sup> Idem.



# **The New Reformation.**

By JULIO NAVARRO MONZO.

The editors of the "Student World" have asked me to write on a subject of such present interest as the New Reformation, of which so much has been said in recent years, and which is seen to be coming by so many everywhere as surely and unavoidably as the new world civilisation that has been surging up since the European War from the closer contact of East and West.

I do not know why, instead of coming to me, they did not rather address themselves to more authoritative pens. For example, Charles A. Ellwood, the well-known North American sociologist. In his great work "The Reconstruction of Religion" it was he who said, and not I, "A New Reformation is necessary within the Christian Church, if it is to survive, beside which the Protestant Reformation will seem insignificant."

## **The Inevitability of the New Reformation.**

If there is a reason for asking me, it must be found in the statements I made some years ago in my study entitled "The Religious Problem in Latin American Culture." I there said that, the Latin countries having had the enormous misfortune of remaining aloof from the Reformation of the sixteenth century, it was now too late to think of their being converted to Protestantism. When the very countries most profoundly influenced by that movement are feeling the need of a New Reformation, the best thing for the Latin countries to do is to seek for themselves their own Reformation, a Reformation that meets the social and intellectual needs of the man of the twentieth century, in place of servilely accepting the fruits of that carried out by the peoples of the North four hundred years ago.

But the editors of the "Student World," having in view the coming meeting of the World's Student Christian Federation in India, do not ask me to write regarding the religious problems of South America. They wish me to state purely and simply what I think of the New Reformation as a present world-wide need, and, since I am a believer in it, to give the reason for my position.

If I am to be reasonably brief, I think it best not to lose time and take up space treating of the need, to me self-evident, of

a new reformation in Christendom, but rather to take up at once its certain and inevitable character, to which I referred at the beginning. Unless Christianity is to disappear, the New Reformation is not a possibility which each can accept or reject according to his individual inclination or as he may see fit. The New Reformation is *a fact*. It is something already on the march, already upon us, although there are thousands of Christians who do not know it, and other thousands who prefer to cover their eyes and stop their ears so as not to perceive it.

The Movement results from five causes which some may consider regrettable if they like, but which, regrettable or not, are so sure, so patent, in fact, that nobody, however much he may dispute them, finds himself able to deny their existence.

1. *Our idea of God has changed.*

There are, naturally, in the modern world a great many people who still hold a conception of God identical with that found in books like Exodus and Leviticus, just as there are millions of henotheists, of polytheists, or those who worship the dead, or spirits or animals. There are on the other hand, especially among the educated, thousands who simply do not believe in God at all. Between these positions stand those with the religious mentality of the modern man for whom God is not, and cannot be, a monarch, vain and capricious, distributing favours to those who flatter him and hating those who forget him.

Such a conception of God presented problems treated in the book of Job and those to which the Prophet Habakkuk alludes. "Why do the innocent suffer? Why do the wicked prosper?" There is not a single mother who, having seen her little child die, has not asked herself these questions, not an honest man broken by the perfidy of a rascal who has not struggled with the same problem. But confronted by the pessimistic view of life which modern biology has brought us, with its inflexible laws of struggle and the survival of the fittest, the question has taken on a new interest. Is there a place for God in the midst of an inexorable struggle that makes of the earth a battle ground? Can one believe in Providence in the presence of volcanic eruptions and earthquakes that wipe out whole populations who, like the men killed by the falling tower of Siloam, were certainly not worse than the rest of the inhabitants of Jerusalem?

The answer to this tremendous question has been given us by such authorities as Samuel Butler, Bergson, Eucken, Driesch,

but their reply is not evidently that which Jehovah gave Job and his friends, nor is it in accord with the famous illustration of St. Paul when he compares God to a potter and man to his vessel.

### God as the Will of Righteousness.

In the bosom of nature which, as Paul himself said, seems to be suffering travail, seeking to bring forth forms of life increasingly beautiful, ever more perfect, can be surely discerned a purpose and a divine will. This will, which "makes the sun to rise on the just and unjust" is without doubt good and paternal, as Jesus taught. But more surely still, it is not the God omnipotent, despotic and terrible, spoken of in the old books of the Hebrews, and about whom the Scholastic and Calvinistic theologians held so much discussion. It is a Will of Righteousness, an endeavour which seeks to create, with man and through him, cultural values, spiritual values, holiness. But it is not a magnificent monarch, seated on a throne, complacently pleased with the smoke of burning sacrifices, or prayers full of the adulation of vassals. It is surely our Father, since we all carry within us that same yearning for triumphant righteousness which characterises Him, that divine seed which reveals itself in us as an anxious reaching out for truth, for beauty, for goodness, proving us to be "His offspring." But He is a Father who needs His children just as they need Him. He is a God who agonises and suffers with the suffering, and because of the suffering of humanity, who has need of His sons to cooperate in His work and undertake to help Him establish His Kingdom, in order that His will may be done on earth as it is in Heaven.

#### 2. *Our Conception of Prayer has changed.*

This is an inevitable consequence of the change in our idea of God, even though many of those who have modified their conception of the Godhead have not yet changed their notions with regard to prayer.

Formed in the luxurious atmosphere of the Byzantine world, the Roman Catholic liturgy venerates God as the courtiers of the Lower Empire worshipped Caesar. The belief is that He takes pleasure in hearing songs of praise, breathing incense, receiving honours on certain days and fixed hours. Even the Churches of the Reformation, which greatly simplified some parts of the



Catholic liturgy and suppressed others completely, have not entirely freed themselves from the erroneous conception that, for me, it is impossible to reconcile with the fundamental teaching of Jesus regarding the paternal character of God. They sing hymns to Him, they intone to Him the Psalms.

### The Voice of the Spirit.

All this, if it be clothed in forms of beauty, has undoubtedly a stimulating influence on the human spirit, such as art always exercises. Nevertheless, I believe that it cannot endure if God is conceived, not as a monarch worshipped with all the formality and pomp of a royal court, but as an immanent force in the universe and in each one of us, a Will that strives to urge us toward perfection.

If "in Him we live and move and have our being" the best that a man can do is to give ear through introspection to that small, inner voice which speaks to his conscience. The best forms of prayer are those of which the Spanish mystics speak, and in general all the mystics, with the title of "Inner Prayer." They are *mental prayer* or meditation, *prayer of quiet* or recollection, and *prayer of union* or adoration and intimate communion with God. In place of trying to honour Him with the roll of organs, the smoke of incense and voices of choirs, Christians in general would do better, in my judgment, to imitate the Quakers and meet in silence free from external clamour, and in the calm of interior recollection in order to hear the voice of the Spirit. "The Godhead is near to each one of us, willing to be heard by all who keep silent to listen;" said Socrates, twenty-four centuries ago.

### 3. *Our Conception of the Bible has changed.*

Herbert Spencer says in his autobiography that in his youth, while looking one night at the immensity of the starry heavens, he was struck suddenly by the contrast between that magnificence and the idea that the author of it all should have made, 4,200 years before, a contract with a Mesopotamian shepherd, in order thus to assure Himself of a people that should offer Him sacrifices. Since Herbert Spencer wrote those lines, the knowledge of religions has greatly progressed. To-day we know that if Abraham is not a mythical figure, he never thought of offering sacrifices

to the Spirit which manifests itself in the magnitude of the heavens, but rather to one of the many *djinn*, one of the many tribal *numena* of the Semitic peoples. We know that Jahveh was nothing more than one of those *numena* and that only slowly and by the process of the exclusion of other gods, did the people of Israel, after the great trial of captivity, arrive at the monotheistic conception, identifying their tribal god with the *only* God, "He who made the heavens and the earth." We know that neither Genesis nor Exodus should be considered as historical narratives and that if the whole Old Testament is worth anything at all, if in some parts it has an appreciable value, it is because it contains the record of the religious experience of men like Amos, Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, who, having saturated the worship of Jahveh with a moral content, made of Judaism the universal religion whose finest flower was Jesus.

### A Record of Religious Experience.

Jewish sacerdotalism no longer interests us. We see nothing of value in its nauseating holocausts and its bloody sacrifices, in that "Deaf and Dumb Temple, the object of shame for all men" as it was called in the fourth of the Sibylline Books. In this we seem like those "very virtuous Jews, who, having penetrated to the spirit of the Law, have not continued chained to the surface," of whom Eusebius speaks in his invaluable work "Evangelic Demonstration and Preparation." We have good reason for believing that Jesus, our Master, belonged to that number, the number of those to whom Eusebius refers and who had expressed themselves in such a manner regarding the Temple. We have excellent reasons for thinking that if the Sermon on the Mount is the flower whose roots must be sought for in Amos and Isaiah, the greater number of the prescriptions laid down in Exodus and Leviticus and even in Deuteronomy, constitute a dead weight from which we should, as soon as possible, free our minds and our religious traditions.

But if this be so, if we cannot and should not consider all the Bible "The word of God" unerring and infallible, we find ourselves in a better position for appreciating with serenity the value and significance of the sacred books of other religions anterior to Christianity.

They also, like our Bible, contain much mythical and unacceptable material, but also, like our Bible, there is found

in them a positive contribution to the religious evolution of humanity. Men like Dr. J.N. Farquhar have dedicated their lives to the discovery of those truths, and I think that their labour cannot be lost. The moment must come in which the East and the West together will recognise the fact that while Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Jeremiah prepared the people of Israel to receive the message of Christ, there are in the history of Asia men like Confucius and Zoroaster who performed the same service in the plan of God. To-day no thoughtful and educated man will deny the truth stated centuries ago by St. Ireneus and Clement of Alexandria, that Heraklitus, Socrates, Plato and the Stoics (whose ideas so much influenced St. Paul) prepared Greek thought for receiving the Christian message. There is a strange affinity between the *Hymn to Zeus* by Cleanthes which says "for all are thine offspring" and the Sermon on the Mount when it teaches that we are all children of the Heavenly Father. If such similarities between Christianity and the deepest of Asiatic thought have not been generally recognised it is simply because the West has as much to learn from the East as the latter from the former.

There is a "light that lighteth every man" and I see the day coming when this will be universally recognised. Men of the East and of the West will come, each with his respective traditions, to take their places under the banner of Christ, crown and synthesis of all that is dynamic, noble and pure in the religious thought of all the ages past.

#### 4. *Our conception of the Church has changed.*

With the exception of figures like Sebastian Franck and Gaspar Schwenkfeld, the men of the Reformation in general did not break away from the idea of the Church that predominated and predominates still in Catholicism. They believed that the Church of Rome had deviated from the pure traditions of the primitive Church, and they tried to reform her by returning to what they supposed to be true Christianity. Inspired by the reading of the New Testament and also, unfortunately, by that of the Old, their purpose was no other than that of rectifying the work of the Middle Ages. The Holy Fathers themselves down to St. Augustine, merited, and continue to merit, almost as much respect as the writings rightly or wrongly attributed to Paul, Peter, James, John and Jude.

To-day, on the other hand, a more attentive study and a more



acute criticism of the New Testament have led us to see that the unity and the purity of the Primitive Church is a myth. From the earliest days the Christian community was never united. In the New Testament we see Jewish Christians full of ritualistic preoccupations, such as those of the conventicle of Jerusalem, with James at its head, and liberal, broadminded Jews like Paul who, without having been a direct disciple of Jesus, yet comprehends His spirit better than those who had followed Him from the very first days. We see also Hellenic Christians like the authors of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the Fourth Gospel, and Christians who represent Jewish thought with all its eschatological problems, such as the authors of the Epistle ascribed to James, and of the Revelation. Which of these currents — and one might mention even others — represents the early Church, primitive Christianity? But there is something more still to be said. Is it certain that Jesus had in mind the founding of a Church? Did His lips ever pronounce the word *ekklesia*, by which the Greeks designated their popular assemblies?

### The Invisible Church.

The story of the famous scene in Caesarea Philippi as it appears in Matthew seems more than doubtful. Neither Mark nor Luke mention the matter of corner-stones or of power conferred on Peter to open and shut the gates of Heaven. The late narrative of John, according to which after the resurrection Jesus grants the same power to *all* the apostles, far from confirming Matthew, has all the appearance of rectifying him. Considering the whole matter well it seems much more probable that Jesus who challenges, whip in hand, the sacerdotalism of Jerusalem, never thought of creating a new theocracy, a new sacerdotalism. If the latter, in spite of all the efforts of Montanus, took root in the course of the second century, it is merely because, in contact with the esoteric cults that swarmed in the Hellenic atmosphere, Christianity was infected with the sacerdotalism of the Mysteries. It has nothing to do with the teaching which Matthew summarised in the Sermon on the Mount and which, scattered through Luke, shows us Jesus, as already said, rather an exponent of the anti-legalist and anti-sacerdotal currents which predominated at the fringe of the Hebrew world, among the Jews of the dispersion, of whom the Galilean practically was a part.

In a word, all goes to show that in this, as in many other things, the Reformation of the sixteenth century stopped half-way ; that the Reformation, as Vinet says, " is still in the making ; " that the right road was indicated by men like Franck, Schwenkfeld, Fox, for whom the Church is not an ecclesiastical organisation, but an invisible spiritual stream, composed of those who find themselves united with Christ in spirit and life. The Church lacks all external forms. It cannot be said, Lo, here it is ! Or, Lo, there it is ! Those make up the Church who participate in the divine life, and only God Himself knows His own.

#### 5. *Our conception of Christ has changed.*

To-day it does not interest us in the least to know whether Christ was or was not a fulfilment of the Messianic teachings, which after the captivity in Babylon, and particularly during the persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes, so much occupied the attention of the Jews. For us it is a regrettable fact that the Synoptic Gospels and in particular Matthew, give so much time to a forcing of the texts of the Old Testament in order to prove that Jesus was the Christ. Less still does it interest us that under Persian influence and a wrong Greek translation of the texts of Isaiah, both Matthew and Luke tried to prove to us that in Jesus was fulfilled the prophecy of Avesta, foretelling that after Zoroaster there would come another saviour born like him of a virgin. The introduction of the visit of the Wise Men to Bethlehem, which has no other object than to confirm that prophecy, seems to us simply deplorable, because it serves no other purpose than to cast the shadow of doubt on the whole Gospel narrative, giving grounds for the position of Couchoud and other supporters of the non-historical character of Jesus.

#### Jesus as Revealer of God.

That which does interest us in Jesus is His sense of absolute filial relation with God. That, having taught us that God is our father — not our owner and less still our maker — He lived entirely in accord with that doctrine of the divine fatherhood, in an absolute surrender which is sketched in His first visit to the Temple, confirmed at the Jordan, perfected after his return from Phoenicia and completed in Gethsemane and on the Cross.

Jesus is the highest expression of the supreme triumph of

that Will which, through the laborious process of cosmic, biological and social evolution, endeavours to express Itself in man, and through him, as a spiritual force, creator of moral values. Jesus is the model man, the perfect man, because He is the perfect incarnation of the divine in man, or, in other terms, the absolute saturation of man with the divine. When the Fourth Gospel, taking from Heraklitus, Plato and the Stoics a conception highly philosophical, tells us that the Word, the Divine intelligence, the Universal Reason, became flesh in Jesus, we can do no other than recognise that this is the truth.

### **The Meaning of the Cross.**

Jesus is the ideal man, and therefore the ideal for man. Unable to conceive of the Heavenly Father that He revealed to us so admirably in the parable of the Prodigal Son, as a cruel and inexorable God who takes pleasure in human sacrifice and suffering, we cannot consider Jesus as an expiatory victim, the Lamb of God, who by His blood washes away the sins of the world. We well know that without His supreme sacrifice on the Cross, preferring to die rather than to be disloyal to Truth, Jesus would not have conquered the world for His teachings. Our hearts overflow with gratitude before such sacrifice, which in truth has redeemed us, has saved us, or is redeeming and saving men from their superstitions, ignorance and routine. But to attribute to such sacrifice an expiatory value, the character of a vicarious satisfaction, seems to us incompatible with the whole spirit of the Sermon on the Mount and the parable, already mentioned, of the Prodigal Son. It can only be explained by taking into account the mentality moulded by the terrible concept of God which certain books of the Old Testament paint for us. The Good News which Jesus brought, revealing God to us as a kindly father, could only be accepted by such mentalities, on the assumption that the God of Sinai had become merciful, had changed His character, in virtue of the sacrifice of His only Son, who with His blood had assuaged the divine wrath.

Such an explanation, however, the modern mind, formed by nineteen centuries of Christianity, does not need and cannot accept. The original idea of the cruel sacrifices agreeable to God which already the great prophets and certain psalmists rejected with horror and disdain, is incompatible with the Gospel.



### The Essence of Christianity.

In place of the five conceptions which we have abandoned regarding God, Prayer, the Bible, the Church and Christ, what has and in my opinion will always have the greatest importance, what constitutes for modern thought the very essence of Christianity, are the following points which the New Reformation, I believe, is called on to preach and to make triumphant :

*a.* The universe is the expression of a Divine Will, the manifestation of an endeavour, directed toward the creation not only of forms ever more perfect, but also toward the expression of spiritual values. A will which, through man, endeavours to reveal Itself as a moral principle, to show Its nature, defined by the Johannine writings as Intelligence, Light, Life, Love.

*b.* Jesus is the supreme culmination of that Force which, endeavouring to express its spiritual nature, tends toward the creation of a morally perfect humanity, what we might call a super-humanity. By His complete identification with the divine, Jesus is the first representative of that spiritual super-humanity, "the first-born among many sons."

*c.* True to the supreme spiritual values which the word God synthesises or symbolises, Jesus dies on a Cross, and in that supreme sacrifice of the perfect man, the man completely identified with God, we have as it were the crystallisation in time and space of an eternal drama. The Cross is the symbol of creation. It is the expression of the agony of the Spirit, bound to the material and nevertheless trying to reveal Itself therein.

### The Eternal in Christ.

*d.* From the Cross on which Christ suffers, God calls men to love Him who loves them with an eternal love, and, through the indisputable, unerring triumph which Jesus achieved for His teachings by means of the Cross, God gives us an absolute pledge that spiritual values, through all sufferings and martyrdom, shall always win over material values ; that the higher shall always be victorious over the lower.

*e.* In this way, Jesus is not only a historical fact within the purely human order. He is the revelation of God. His life, His death and His triumph reveal to us, as well as His teachings, the paternal, loving and sacrificial character of the Godhead. It is not only an exemplary life, the most perfect of all human

lives. Jesus is the expression of a cosmic yearning, and His personality, taking on a universal and eternal value, is the channel for divine energy which undertakes to lift humanity. He is the companion of our souls, He is God brought within reach of man.

*f.* In the light that the divine personality of Christ sheds on us, every human being represents an absolute value, because each one carries within him a divine seed ; longings for conquering moral power, spiritual tendencies ; that is to say, the native capacity to come to know, through the new birth that Jesus taught, that he also is a son of God and, taking Jesus as an example, can conduct himself as He did.

*g.* In view of such capacities, nothing is of higher value than human life, and nothing in each life has more importance than the development of character through communion with the Divine, which as the life of Christ shows us, assures us the victory of the higher and unselfish sentiments, the triumph of our love of Truth, Beauty and Right, over the lower and selfish instincts which man, left to himself, shares with purely animal natures.

### The Intrinsic Value of Personality.

*h.* The intrinsic value of each human being is independent, therefore, of his position, riches or knowledge. It is measured only by his motives and intentions, by what he is really in his character, in the deepest and most intimate recesses of his inner conscience, and not by his external actions that, being imposed by the compulsion of the environment, may be hardly more than the expression of his cowardice or his Pharisaism.

*i.* Because of their divine sonship, *all* men, regardless of their beliefs, nationality, race or culture, should be treated as brothers, as sons, which they are, of one and the same Father ; the Father of each one of us, as it was taught us and revealed to us by Jesus.

*j.* All this must bring about a new order of affairs in the political, social and international realms. The teachings and ideals of Jesus can be fully realised only in a new order of human relations regulated by the spirit of brotherhood, co-operation and mutual helpfulness, ruled by love and good-will, in place of what now holds sway — force and external authority.

*k.* This new order, the Kingdom of God, will not come, nevertheless, except in the measure that men identify themselves

with Christ and, morally regenerated, ascend from the material to the spiritual plane. It is essential that God become incarnate in the whole human family as He was in Christ. Christ must reign, manifesting Himself anew, fully, triumphantly, in all human-kind, in the super-humanity.

### Résumé.

Nous devons d'abord nous rendre nettement compte que la Nouvelle Réformation est un *fait*, bien que beaucoup se refusent à l'admettre. Il est donc inutile de discuter ici jusqu'à quel point elle peut être nécessaire. Depuis quelques années, elle semble de plus en plus inévitable. Ce mouvement de Réforme peut être attribué à cinq causes principales :

1) L'idée que nous nous faisons de Dieu s'est modifiée. Nous avons cessé de croire au Dieu de l'Ancien Testament, au Dieu qui récompense ceux qui le flattent et hait ceux qui l'oublient, au Dieu omnipotent, despotique et terrible. Nos réponses aux formidables problèmes de la souffrance, de la lutte et du malheur ne sont plus celles que nous trouvons dans le Livre de Job. Nous voyons plutôt dans la nature la Volonté Divine à l'œuvre dans l'homme et par l'homme pour le progrès de la justice, ayant besoin des hommes et souffrant avec ceux qui souffrent. Ce Dieu est notre Père, parce qu'il y a en chacun de nous des aspirations vers la beauté et la bonté qui témoignent que nous sommes Ses enfants.

2) Notre conception de la prière a changé. Les vieilles liturgies offrent à Dieu un tribut de prières et de louanges, comme les hommes offrent un tribut à un monarque de la terre ; ils L'adorent comme un roi sur son trône, entouré de toute la pompe d'une cour. Mais, puisque Dieu est en nous-mêmes, nous n'entendons jamais mieux Sa voix qu'en écoutant celle de notre conscience. Les meilleures formes de la prière sont celles des mystiques, la prière mentale, la prière silencieuse. Il serait bon pour nous tous d'imiter les Quakers et de nous réunir dans le silence et l'adoration et dans le calme du recueillement intérieur.

3) Notre interprétation de la Bible a changé. Nous savons maintenant que c'est seulement par un développement progressif (la première conception de Jéhovah, Dieu national du peuple d'Israël, se transformant en un véritable monothéisme) que le Dieu de l'Ancien Testament est devenu le Dieu des prophètes, dont le culte tout imprégné de sève morale a fait du Judaïsme une religion universelle. Nous avons cessé de considérer l'Ancien Testament comme contenant dans toutes ses parties la parole infaillible de Dieu. Il a pour nous, avant tout, la valeur d'un témoignage de l'expérience religieuse. Et cette attitude nous permet de mieux apprécier les textes sacrés des autres religions et de les considérer comme une contribution à l'évolution religieuse de l'humanité. Confucius et Zoroastre ont rendu à l'Orient les mêmes services qu'Isaïe et Jérémie à l'Occident.

4) Notre conception de l'Eglise s'est modifiée. La Réforme protestante ne s'est pas vraiment détachée de la conception ancienne de l'Eglise. Elle a plutôt tenté de revenir aux traditions de l'Eglise primitive que, selon elle, le catholicisme avait abandonnées.

Mais des Etudes plus approfondies et la critique biblique nous ont démontré que c'est probablement une illusion de croire à l'existence d'une Eglise primitive unique et unie. Il est même douteux que Jésus ait jamais



eu l'intention de fonder une Eglise au sens sacerdotal du mot. Le développement du « sacerdotalisme » a plutôt eu pour cause l'influence des cultes ésotériques et des religions à mystères de l'époque. On peut donc dire que la Réforme protestante a été incomplète ; il nous reste à faire encore un pas en avant et à comprendre que l'Eglise n'est pas une institution ecclésiastique mais une invisible communion spirituelle de tous ceux qui, par l'esprit et la vie, sont unis dans le Christ.

5) Notre conception du Christ a changé. Il ne nous importe plus guère de voir dans la venue du Christ l'accomplissement des prédictions messianiques des prophètes juifs. Toute tentative de ce genre pour forcer le sens des textes de l'Ancien Testament nous semble déplorable. Ce qui nous frappe en Jésus, c'est sa relation filiale avec Dieu, réalisée d'une manière absolue dans son enseignement comme dans sa vie. Il est la plus haute expression de la Volonté Divine, la parfaite incarnation du divin dans l'homme, l'homme idéal et l'idéal pour l'homme. Nous avons cessé de voir dans sa mort un sacrifice propitiatoire fait à un Dieu cruel et inexorable afin d'assurer à l'humanité pécheresse la miséricorde et le pardon. Elle nous semble plutôt le suprême sacrifice d'un esprit fidèle jusqu'à la mort à la vérité et à l'amour, sacrifice capable comme tel de nous sauver et de nous relever de notre bassesse naturelle.

Voici donc les principes directeurs de la Nouvelle Réformation : l'univers est l'expression de la Volonté Divine, qui se révèle par la nature morale de l'homme. Jésus est l'expression suprême de cette Volonté, qui s'efforce de créer une humanité moralement parfaite, ce que nous pourrions appeler une « sur-humanité » spirituelle. La Croix est le symbole des souffrances de l'esprit dans le monde, la cristallisation dans le temps et dans l'espace d'un drame éternel, et le gage du triomphe final des valeurs spirituelles sur les valeurs matérielles. L'existence de Jésus n'est pas seulement un fait historique, mais une révélation de Dieu ; sa personne a une valeur universelle et éternelle, à la lumière de laquelle la personne humaine prend à son tour une valeur absolue, parce qu'elle renferme en germe la vie et l'esprit du Christ. Par la nouvelle naissance que Jésus a prêchée, nous devenons les fils de Dieu. La valeur intrinsèque de la personne humaine résulte de la capacité de l'homme à communier avec la Divinité ; c'est une valeur indépendante de la situation, de la richesse, de la connaissance, de la nationalité, de la race et de la culture. La reconnaissance de ce fait entraîne le besoin de voir régner un esprit de fraternité et de coopération dans les relations politiques, sociales et internationales, afin que, dans l'ordre nouveau, le Royaume de Dieu soit établi sur la terre, grâce à la régénération morale et spirituelle des hommes par le Christ. C'est ainsi seulement que pourra naître l'humanité supérieure, la « sur-humanité ».

# Das Christentum und die Moderne Gesellschaft

Von PAUL TILLICH.

Die erste Frage, die zu beantworten ist, wenn nach dem Verhältnis von Christentum und moderner Gesellschaft gefragt wird, lautet : Welches ist der Standort, von dem aus die Frage gestellt ist und von dem aus sie beantwortet werden soll ? Diese Frage aber enthüllt sofort die ganze Schwierigkeit des Unternehmens. Wird nämlich gesagt : Vom Standort des Christentums aus, so wird vorausgesetzt, dass man das Christentum zur Verfügung habe als einen Standort, den man jenseits der modernen Gesellschaft einnehmen könne, wenn man nur wolle. Und umgekehrt : Wenn man sagt, vom Standpunkt der modernen Gesellschaft aus, so setzt man voraus, dass dieser Standort neben dem Christentum zu finden sei, wenn man ihn nur suche. Aber beide Voraussetzungen sind falsch : Niemand hat das Christentum ausserhalb der modernen Gesellschaft, in der er lebt, die ihn trägt und formt mit ihrer Sprache, ihren Einrichtungen, ihren Menschen. Und wenn er noch so leidenschaftlich versuchte, sich diesem seinen Mutterboden zu entziehen : Es gelingt nicht, es gelingt in keinem Augenblick. Und wenn er sich ausschliesslich auf die Bibel oder die alte Kirchenlehre gründen wollte, so würde doch unbewusst jedes Wort, das er liest, durch sein eigenes Verstehen und d.h. zuletzt durch Sprache und Leben der modernen Gesellschaft gefärbt sein. Niemand kann sich selbst entziehen. Wir selbst : das ist zum grössten Teil die moderne Gesellschaft, in der wir leben. Es gibt für uns also keinen Standort des Christentums abgesehen von der modernen Gesellschaft. Aber ebensowenig gibt es einen Standort der modernen Gesellschaft abgesehen vom Christentum. Niemand der in der Moderne lebt, kann sich dem Christentum entziehen. In alle Einrichtungen und Sitten, in Sittlichkeit und Geistesleben der modernen Gesellschaft ist das Christentum eingegangen. Man kann profan sein, aber man kann nicht "Heide" sein. Denn "Heide" ist ein religiöser Begriff, und er bezeichnet diejenige religiöse Haltung, die vom Christentum zerbrochen ist, der das Christentum das gute Gewissen genommen, die es als dämonisch offenbart hat. Der Standort der modernen Gesellschaft ist kein Standort ausserhalb des Christentums.

Wenn wir also von dem Verhältnis des Christentums zur modernen Gesellschaft reden, so können wir es immer nur als solche tun, die in beiden stehen, deren Standort der Schnittpunkt beider ist. Wir selbst, die Fragenden und Antwortenden, sind Produkte des Zusammenwirkens beider und niemandem ist es möglich, aus dieser Einheit die verschiedenen Elemente herauszudestillieren. Wir verstehen das Christentum als Glieder der modernen Gesellschaft und wir verstehen die moderne Gesellschaft als vom Christentum geformte. Diese Sachlage bedeutet, dass wir mit der Frage nach dem Verhältnis von Christentum und Gesellschaft eine konkrete Frage stellen, die Frage nach unserer konkreten Existenz. Und sie bedeutet weiter, dass wir die Antwort nicht geben können von einem Standort ausserhalb dieser unserer eigenen Existenz, ausserhalb der Einheit von beiden. Jede Antwort, die hier gegeben werden kann, ist ein Ringen um unsere eigene Lage, ist ein Sprung aus unserer Gegenwart in unsere Zukunft und hat darum den Ernst des Wagnisses. Nicht als akademische Betrachtung, bei der wir aus dem Spiel blieben, sondern als Tat, in der es um uns selbst geht, hat die Frage nach dem Verhältnis des Christentums zur modernen Gesellschaft einen Sinn.

Die Antwort muss notwendig das geistesgeschichtliche Verhältnis beider Grössen berücksichtigen. Sie ist damit eine Weiterführung und Begründung des eben in der Einleitung Gesagten. Der Hintergrund der modernen Gesellschaft in ihrer religiösen Substanz ist das Christentum. Das Christentum überhaupt und das protestantische Christentum im besonderen. Hinter allem Denken und Leben der modernen Gesellschaft steht die jüdischchristliche Ueberwindung des heidnisch-dämonischen Weltgefühls. Der Glaube an die Schöpfung enthält dieses, dass die Materie, auch die irdische, nicht gegengöttlich ist, dass sie als Setzung Gottes vollkommen ist in all ihren Stufen, dass es darum nicht nötig ist, sie zu fliehen, um zu Gott zu kommen. Ein volles Ja fällt von hier auf alle Schöpfung. Das Ja der Renaissance zur Erde, die Aufnahme der Erde in die Welt der Gestirne, die Behauptung dass das Göttliche der Sternwelt nicht näher sei als der Erde, dass es überall ganz gegenwärtig sei, das ist in der Tiefe christlicher Schöpfungsglaube, das steht im Widerspruch zu dem Lebensgefühl der gesamten Antike, theoretisch und praktisch. Und der christliche Monotheismus enthält dieses, dass die Welt nicht von verschiedenen göttlichen Gewalten regiert wird und damit im tiefsten Grunde zerspalten, dämonisch ist, sondern dass sie einen einheitlichen Sinn, einen



einheitlichen Ursprung und ein einheitliches Ziel hat: Das Göttliche ist geistig-sittliche Einheit, und die Welt ist zum Ort ihrer Herrschaft bestimmt. Der Glaube der Renaissance an die Erde als Ort sinnvoller Gestaltung, die Verheissung eines Reiches der Gerechtigkeit und Menschlichkeit, wie sie durch die Utopieen jener Zeit klingt, ist nicht antik, sondern christlich. Und wenn es auch so schien, als wären die alten Götter wiedergekommen, nicht sie selbst kamen wieder, sondern ihre Kraft wurde aufgenommen in den einen, aller dämonischen Zerspaltenheit enthobenen sittlichen Gott. Götter sterben nicht, aber Götter kehren auch nicht wieder. Sie wandeln sich und gehen ein in den wahren Gott. Nicht die Götter der Antike beherrschen die Renaissance und die moderne Gesellschaft, sondern der eine Gott, von dem das Christentum zeugt.

Zu diesem fernerer, oft zu wenig beachteten Hintergrund der modernen Gesellschaft kommt der nähere, viel behandelte protestantische. Erst durch ihn ist die moderne Gesellschaft überhaupt möglich. Dem Protestantismus verdankt sie den Persönlichkeitsgedanken und die Heiligung des täglichen Lebens. Die Religion der Sakramente und der Hierarchie zerbrach vor dem Ansturm des persönlichen mit Gott ringenden Gewissens, dem niemand und nichts, auch keine heilige Wirklichkeit, keine "Gestalt der Gnade" die Verantwortung abnehmen kann. Und alle heiligen Bezirke, alles sakramentale und asketische Werk wird wertlos vor dem täglich geübten Gehorsam. Beides ist übergegangen in die moderne Gesellschaft, und zwar in mannigfachen Formen.

Das Persönlichkeitsideal kann mehr als subjektive Frömmigkeit aufgefasst werden — so im Pietismus und Methodismus — oder mehr als Unterwerfung des Sünders unter Gericht und Gnade — so in der Orthodoxie. Und die Heiligung des Alltäglichen kann mehr eine Heiligung des Bestehenden sein — so auf lutherischem Boden — und mehr eine Heiligung des umgestaltenden Werkes — so auf reformiertem Boden. Immer aber ist es typisch protestantischer Geist, der sich darin auswirkt. Und die moderne Gesellschaft trägt ihn in der einen oder in der anderen Form in sich, ob sie es weiss oder nicht.

Dann freilich: Dieses alles ist Hintergrund. Der Vordergrund aber sieht anders aus. Dieses alles ist die Substanz der modernen Gesellschaft, von der sie bis heute lebt, aber die Form ist es längst nicht mehr. Denn es kommt ein neues Moment hinzu: Die Profanisierung, die Entheiligung, die Verdiesseitigung des religiösen Erbgutes. Die moderne Gesellschaft ist profan.

Ihr Pathos geht auf das Diesseits um des Diesseits willen. Sie ist — wie ich es früher in der "Religiösen Lage der Gegenwart" ausgedrückt habe — "In sich ruhende Endlichkeit". Die religiöse Persönlichkeit beider Formen ist übergegangen in profane Persönlichkeitstypen, humanistische oder romantische; und die Heiligung des täglichen Lebens ist übergegangen in Alltäglichkeit. Das ja zur Schöpfung, zur Erde ist übergegangen in Weltlichkeit und der Wille zur religiösen Weltgestaltung in autonome Politik, Wirtschaft und Technik. Für jedes dieser Dinge lassen sich noch die protestantisch-christlichen Hintergründe aufweisen; aber jedes hat sich zugleich losgerissen von seinem Hintergrund. Die moderne Gesellschaft ist die autonome und profane Entwicklungsstufe der christlich-protestantischen Gesellschaft. Darin liegt Einheit und Gegensatz beschlossen. Darin ist zugleich die völlige Unsicherheit begründet, in der beide zueinander stehen: Ein Hin- und Herschwanken zwischen Ja und Nein, zwischen Identifikation und Widerspruch.

Das Christentum kann nicht umhin, in der modernen Gesellschaft sich selbst wiederzuerkennen, zugleich aber in ihr den Ort aller Widersprüche gegen sich zu sehen. Und die moderne Gesellschaft bleibt trotz allen Protestes gegen Bedrohungen ihrer Autonomie durch die Kirchen in pietätvoller Anerkennung der christlichen Substanz als der eigenen. Aus dieser Sachlage ergeben sich die mannigfaltigen Verschlingungen beider Grössen, das ganze reiche Wechselspiel, das zu durchschauen nur von hier aus möglich ist. Während die alte Kirche eine heidnische Gesellschaft in religiösen und profanisierten Formen sich gegenüber hatte, während die mittelalterliche Kirche eine substantiell heidnische, kulturell, christliche Gesellschaft neben sich hatte, steht die moderne Kirche mit einer substantiell christlichen, kulturell profanen Gesellschaft in Einheit und Spannung zugleich (Vergl. Rosenstock und Wittig "Das Alter der Kirche"). Das hat nun ein Doppeltes zur Folge gehabt: Einmal das Aufgehen der Kirchen in den Schöpfungen der profanisierten, modernen Gesellschaft, auf der anderen Seite einen ohnmächtigen Protest gegen die moderne Gesellschaft vom Standort älterer geistiger und gesellschaftlicher Formen aus.

Das historische Schicksal der verschiedenen Ausprägungen des Protestantismus hat zu sehr verschiedenen Lösungen auf dieser allgemeinen Grundlage geführt. Auf lutherischem Boden stand im Vordergrund das Verhältnis zum *geistigen* Leben der modernen Gesellschaft, auf Calvinistischem Boden das Verhältnis zum *sozialen* Leben. In der lutherisch bestimmten Kultur fielen

die Entscheidungen auf philosophischem und literarischem Gebiet, in der calvinistisch bestimmten Kultur auf politischem und sozialem Gebiet. Aber natürlich ist dieser Gegensatz nicht ausschliesslich. Dass im Luthertum die geistige Innerlichkeit in den Vordergrund gedrängt wurde, hing zusammen mit der Struktur der Gesellschaft in den lutherischen Landeskirchen. Dass im Calvinismus die wirtschaftlich-soziale Gestaltung entscheidend wurde, ist mitbegründet in der grundsätzlichen Lösung der geistigen Probleme.

Die Lösung der Erkenntnisfragen ist auf dem Boden der englisch-amerikanischen Kultur grundsätzlich konservativ. Die autonome Wissenschaft und Philosophie steht daneben. Ein Bedürfnis nach Ausgleich fehlt im Grossen und Ganzen. Gott wird an die Grenzen des philosophischen Systems verbannt ohne Einfluss auf das Ganze. Die Ethik wird auf das Prinzip der Nützlichkeit gegründet, lebt aber inhaltlich von Resten des christlichen Ethos, für deren profane Umdeutung der Begriff des Altruismus typisch ist. Umso energischer wird die Umgestaltung der Gesellschaft in Angriff genommen. Die englische Revolution schafft im Namen des Christentums und als Verwirklichung der Gottesherrschaft die bürgerliche Gesellschaft. Alle dämonisch rauschhaften Elemente der Feudalzeit in Religion und Lebensgestaltung werden unterdrückt. Die Bibel wird zum Gesetzbuch der Völker. Auch das Königtum muss sich ihm unterwerfen. Die im Prädestinationsglauben ruhende heroische Persönlichkeit unterwirft sich die Welt, selbst unterworfen dem Gehorsam des göttlichen Gesetzes. Aber Heroismus ist keine Dauerhaltung; sie ist die Möglichkeit einer gesellschaftlichen Schicht in einem historischen Augenblick. Dann geht sie über in Sitte und Gesetz. So entstand die Lebensform der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft. Die religiöse Gestaltung wandelte sich in wirtschaftlich-technische Weltbeherrschung, in Humanität und profane Persönlichkeitsformung. Der religiöse Hintergrund blieb erhalten. Er darf bis heute nicht angetastet werden. Dafür sorgt die Unerschüttertheit in der geistigen und Erkenntnis-Sphäre. Aber man gleitet unmerklich ins Profane, das unausgesprochen um so selbstverständlicher sich durchsetzt. Und mit der Profanisierung kommt die christliche Gestaltung in die Hände der tragenden Mächte der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft, der wirtschaftlichen und der politischen. Einordnung in die Lebensformen des wirtschaftlich herrschenden Bürgertums und Unterordnung unter die politische Einheit des herrschenden angelsächsisch-bürgerlichen Reiches wird gleichgesetzt mit Einordnung in die Theokratie;



und auch das mit umso grösserer Wirksamkeit, als es unbewusst geschieht. Damit aber ist ein Standpunkt möglicher Opposition des Christentums gegen die bürgerliche Gesellschaft verschwunden. Christentum und moderne Gesellschaft sind zur Identität gebracht.

Während also auf dem Erkenntnisgebiet der westliche Protestantismus die autonome Kultur unangetastet neben sich lässt, aber auch seine eigene dogmatische Grundlage unangetastet bewahrt, schafft er im sozialen Gebiet die bürgerliche Gesellschaft, mit der er sich identifiziert. In beiden Haltungen aber ist eine kritische Opposition gegen die moderne Gesellschaft unmöglich geworden.

Auf dem Boden der lutherisch gestimmten Kirchen ist die gesamte geistige Formung unmittelbar durch das Christentum mitbestimmt. In der deutschen Klassik und Romantik geht es letztlich immer um den Gottesgedanken. Das Ringen um eine "theonome" Kultur geht durch die gesamte deutsche Philosophie. Und umgekehrt dringen aus Philosophie und Literatur ständig umgestaltende Kräfte in die Theologie und wandeln alle Symbole der religiösen Erkenntnis. Hier ist die Kampf- und Ausgleichsphäre zwischen Christentum und moderner Gesellschaft. Dabei schien es eine Zeitlang, als ginge das Christentum ein in die so geschaffenen Formen, als käme es zur Identifizierung mit dem Geist des deutschen Idealismus. Aber diese Gefahr wurde grundsätzlich überwunden durch die Katastrophe des Idealismus im 19-Jahrhundert. Dann erhob sich die entgegengesetzte Gefahr: Die Trennung von Religion und Erkenntnis nach Art des westlichen Protestantismus. Seit der Jahrhundertwende ist auch diese Gefahr überwunden. Und wir stehen mitten in einem höchst lebendigen und beiderseitig fruchtbaren Miteinander und Gegeneinander von christlichem und autonomen Geistesleben. Das heimliche Ziel ist dabei auf allen Seiten "Theonomie," d.h. christliche Erfülltheit der autonomen Formen.

Ganz anders in der sozialen und politischen Sphäre. Hier war nicht wie im Westen die aktive revolutionäre Gesellschaft Trägerin der protestantischen Gestaltung sondern das Landesfürstentum. Durch die Lehre vom Landesfürsten als oberstem Bischof wurde diese seine Stellung religiös geweiht. Durch Luthers Lehre von der göttlichen Einsetzung auch der widerchristlichen Obrigkeit wurde jede mögliche Gestaltung im Gegensatz zum Staat verboten. Die protestantischen Kirchen wurden zum Ressort der Staatsverwaltung. Die bürgerliche

Revolution des 19. Jahrhunderts hatte keine religiöse Bedeutung mehr; sie wurde von den Kirchen verneint. Der proletarischen Bewegung gegenüber wurde der Versuch gemacht, sie ins Patriarchalisch-Landesfürstliche umzubiegen und sie gleichzeitig für Christentum und Monarchie zu gewinnen. Als das misslang, wurde sie eben so scharf und noch schärfer bekämpft wie die bürgerliche Revolution, mit deren Auswirkungen man sich inzwischen einigermaßen abgefunden hatte. Immerhin war diese Abfindung keine vollständige. Ein stiller Protest gegen die moderne bürgerliche Gesellschaft blieb immer erhalten. Er ging aus von der kleinbürgerlich-feudalen Struktur der lutherischen Landeskirchen, von der Verbindung des Christentums mit der vorbürgerlichen Gesellschaftsordnung. Als er mit dem Zerschlagen der Monarchie und des Landesfürstentums sich nicht mehr staatlich sichern konnte, verband er sich nach der Revolution mit denjenigen Parteien, in denen die altkonservativen Elemente am deutlichsten bewahrt waren. So entstand die innige, wenn auch offiziell gelegnete Verbindung zwischen lutherischer Kirche und deutschnationaler Partei. Aber der Protest, der von hier gegen die moderne Gesellschaft ergeht, ist ohnmächtig, weil er im Namen einer grundsätzlich überwundenen Gesellschaftsstruktur ergeht. Er kommt nicht aus dem Zentrum des gegenwärtigen sozialen Geschehens. Und infolge der innigen politischen Verbundenheit der konservativen Kreise mit dem wirtschaftlich herrschenden Bürgertum wirkt sich der antibürgerliche Protest ausschliesslich als Kampf gegen die sozialistische Bewegung aus. Es ist fast unmöglich, dass ein Proletarier das antibürgerlich-christliche Element sieht, das im Konservatismus, namentlich jüngerer Geistiger enthalten ist; zu offenkundig ist der entschlossene politische Gegensatz, in den sich die konservativen Parteien gegen ihn stellen. So ist die Wirkung des Christentums auf die politisch-soziale Gestaltung überaus gering. Nur in den Grenzgebieten der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft, im Bauerntum, im mittleren Beamten- und Kleinbürgertum machen sich Wirkungen geltend, die aber überwiegend konserverender Art sind und darum völlig unschöpferisch bleiben. Diese Tatsachen sind nun ihrerseits nicht ohne Wichtigkeit für die geistige Sphäre. Die Gefahr wird immer grösser, dass weite Kreise der evangelischen Kirche einer Ideologie verfallen, die mit der realen Struktur der Gesellschaft nichts mehr zu tun hat. Geistiges Leben, mag es noch so lebendig sein, ist zur Fruchtlosigkeit und Entleerung verurteilt, wenn es nicht aus der wirklichen gesellschaftlichen Lage und den Aufgaben, die sie

stellt, neue Antriebe erhält. Es ist der überaus schwierige Versuch des religiösen Sozialismus, gleichzeitig im Geistigen und Sozialen zu einer Gestaltung der kommenden Gesellschaft zu führen, in der das autonome Leben der Gesellschaft erfüllt ist mit sinngebenden Kräften des Christentumes. Ob dieser Versuch Erfolg haben wird, ist bei der Versteifung der Gegensätze und bei dem Wirklichkeitsgewicht der kapitalistisch-bürgerlichen Wirtschaftsordnung höchst fraglich. Unternommen muss er dennoch werden. Er ist — soweit ich sehe — die einzige Bewegung, die das Problem, "Christentum und moderne Gesellschaft" da angreift, wo es angegriffen werden muss, an dem Punkt der schärfsten gesellschaftlichen Spannung, in dem Gegensatz von Bürgertum und Proletariat.

Aber freilich, auch der religiöse Sozialismus, und wenn er viel mächtiger und wirksamer wäre, als er es tatsächlich ist, kann das nicht *machen*, was Voraussetzung eines wirklich lebendigen Verhältnisses von Christentum und moderner Gesellschaft ist: Die anschauliche Gegenwart christlichen "Seins," die Gestalt der Gnade: (Ueber diesen Begriff vergl. Kairos Bd. 2, mein Aufsatz über "Der Protestantismus als kritisches und gestaltendes Prinzip"). Das ist es, was der Katholizismus vor den protestantischen Kirchen voraus hat, dass in ihm eine solche, wenn auch dämonisierte Gestalt der Gnade da ist und sichtbar wirkt. Daher ist sein Verhältnis zur modernen Gesellschaft so viel leichter zu bestimmen. Aber es ist auch weniger tief und weniger fruchtbar. Denn der Katholizismus repräsentiert eine Gestalt der Gnade, die durch den Protestantismus mit nicht zurücknehmbarer historischer Macht in die Vergangenheit gedrängt ist. Von ihm aus ist das Gegenwartsproblem nicht zu lösen. Aber der Blick von ihm auf den Protestantismus zeigt eins: wo eine anschauliche Gestalt der Gnade fehlt, fällt das religiöse Leben den staatlichen und gesellschaftlichen Mächten anheim; es kann der Profanisierung nicht entgehen. Es schwankt zwischen unschöpferischem Protest und naiver Gleichsetzung. Nur wo und nur insoweit eine Gestalt der Gnade anschaulich in der Wirklichkeit steht, nicht erstarrt und nicht herrschaftlich wie im Katholizismus, sondern hinweisend auf das Jenseits der Gesellschaft und zugleich teilnehmend am Ringen der autonomen Kultur, nur da gibt es eine Lösung des Problems "Christentum und moderne Gesellschaft."

Uns ist es also nicht gegeben, eine allgemeine Lösung zu sagen, sondern wir haben die Aufgabe, an jedem einzelnen Punkt um eine neue Gestalt der Gnade zu ringen, die mitten in der modernen



Gesellschaft als ihr Gericht, ihr Sinn und der Hinweis auf ihre Erfüllung steht. Je tiefer wir in unserem geschichtlichen Augenblick, je tiefer wir in den Spannungen des Christentums und der modernen Gesellschaft stehen, desto eher wird sich durch uns das vollziehen, was von unserem Wollen unabhängig ist : Das Werden einer " Gestalt der Gnade " in der Christentum und kommende Gesellschaft ein neues Verhältnis eingegangen sind.

### Summary.

The first thing to recognise, in approaching the question of the relationship of Christianity to modern society, is that it is impossible to draw a clear distinction between the two. We cannot get entirely outside of Christianity in order to judge it from the point of view of modern society, or entirely outside of modern society in order to judge it from the point of view of Christianity. One is bound up with the other ; we only know Christianity as it is translated into the language of the world in which we live, and on the other hand, we cannot live in the modern world without coming constantly into contact with the Christianity which has gone to shape all its forms and institutions.

The solution of the problem is bound up with the intellectual history of the relation of the two forces. The background of modern society, as regards its substance, is Christianity — Christianity in general and Protestant Christianity in particular. Behind all modern thought lies the Jewish-Christian victory over the heathen-daemonic conception of life. The belief in the Divine Creation implies the acceptance of the created world ; Christian monotheism implies a world that is not torn between various divine powers, but that has a single unified meaning, origin and purpose ; the Divine as an intellectual and moral unity, and the world as the place of Its destined sovereignty. The true meaning of the Renaissance was not a re-birth of the old gods, but a passing over of their power into the one, undivided, morally active God. It is not the old gods, but the God of Christianity, who dominates the Renaissance and the modern world.

As distinct from this general Christian background, the specifically *Protestant* influence has made itself felt in modern society in the idea of personality and in the sanctification of daily life. It was the emergence of the individual conscience, and its direct contact with God, which brought about the downfall of the religion of sacraments and hierarchy, while at the same time all sacramentalism and asceticism was seen to be valueless as against the discipline of daily obedience. The idea of personality found its more subjective development in pietism and Methodism ; in orthodox Lutheranism it was seen more as the subjection of the individual sinner to judgment and grace. The sanctification of daily life was conceived in Lutheran circles more as a sanctification of the existing social order ; in Calvinistic societies as the sanctification of the process of transformation. And both these tendencies have been absorbed into modern society.

This Christian element however is only the substance of modern society ; its form is quite other. Modern society is definitely worldly, this-worldly. It rests in the temporary. In it, the Protestant idea of

personality has taken on a purely secular, humanistic or romantic form, while the sanctification of daily life has become the apotheosis of the commonplace. The Christian acceptance of the world of creation has become worldliness, and the will to a transformation of society has developed into the autonomous conduct of politics, economics and applied science. Modern society represents Christian-Protestant society in its autonomous and secularised stage of development. Thus it contains within itself both a unity and a conflict.

The early Church was faced by a heathen society clothed in worldly and religious forms; the mediaeval Church existed side by side with a society heathen in substance but Christian in form, whilst the modern Church is in a state at once of union and of tension with a society which is Christian in substance but worldly in form. The development of this relationship has varied with the various forms of Protestantism. In Lutheran societies the relation to the intellectual element of modern social life was in the foreground; in Calvinistic countries, the relation to its social element; in the former the questions to be solved were philosophical and literary; in the latter, they were political and social.

In England and America the intellectual problems of religion were solved along conservative lines, whilst science and philosophy developed independently; there has been no real attempt at a synthesis. The system of ethics was based on the principle of utility, but with an inherited Christian *ethos*, which in its secularised form has become "altruism." In England, middle-class society was established by the Revolution in the name of "Christianity" and regarded as a realisation of the Kingdom of God. The daemonic elements of the feudal system were suppressed, and the Bible became the law of the peoples, to which even the throne was subject. In the middle-class society thus created, religion gives place to the economic and scientific mastery of nature, the idea of humanity, and the development of personality in a purely worldly sense. And with the ever-increasing secularisation of religion, the shaping of Christianity falls more and more into the hands of the dominating forces of bourgeois society — the economic and political; the Church becomes more and more identified with the existing social order, and thus opposition to society on the part of the Church becomes impossible.

In Lutheran lands, on the contrary, the whole intellectual development was influenced by Christianity. German classic and Romantic literature is especially concerned with the idea of God, and the struggle for a "theonomic" solution permeates German philosophy; on the other hand, philosophy and literature exercise an uninterrupted influence on theology and religious symbolism. For a time it seemed as if the result would be to identify Christianity with German idealism, but this danger passed with the breakdown of idealism in the nineteenth century. The contrary danger, the separation of religion and knowledge, such as had happened in Calvinistic Protestantism, has been overcome since the beginning of this century. The present situation — one of a Christianity and an autonomous intellectual life in alternate harmony and opposition — is full of fruitful possibilities.

In the social and political sphere, however, the case is quite different. In Lutheran countries Protestantism was formed not by the revolutionary spirit, but by the system of local princedoms. Luther's doctrine of the divine nature of authority, even when unchristian in character, rendered impossible any sort of opposition between Church and State, and the Church became a State instrument. The middle-class revolution of the

nineteenth century was not accepted by the Church. Later, an attempt was made to capture the labour movement, and incorporate it into the system of princely government; when that failed, it also was bitterly attacked. The Church remained in spirit attached to the pre-bourgeois social system; after the revolution and the collapse of the monarchy, it identified itself with the more conservative elements in the country. But this protest against the present form of society is powerless, since it is made in the name of a social structure which is obsolete. In practice it becomes a campaign, not against bourgeois society, but against socialism. It results in making the influence of Christianity on political and social developments exceedingly slight, and this is not without danger in the intellectual sphere. It tends to result in wide circles of the Church accepting an ideology that has no relation to the actual social structure. The task of "religious socialism" is to work for a form of society in which the autonomous cultural forms, both intellectual and social, shall be filled with the spirit and force of Christianity. It is doubtful whether it will succeed in this task; the forces of the existing capitalistic-bourgeois social order may be too strong for it; but at least it represents the only movement which attacks the problem "Christianity and Modern Society" at the point of greatest tension — the conflict between the middle-class and labour.

But the really necessary condition for a truly living relation between Christianity and modern society is the embodiment of Christianity in a visible form, a "form of Grace." In this respect Catholicism has an advantage over Protestantism, and this makes its relation to modern society much easier to determine, although its historical supersession by Protestantism renders it incapable of solving the social problems of the moment. It must be clearly realised that when this visible "form of Grace" is lacking, religious life becomes subject to social and political forces, and is of necessity secularised. The solution of the problem "Christianity and modern society" can only be found in a "Form of Grace" which is neither fossilised nor authoritarian (like Catholicism) but which, while looking beyond the limits of human society, at the same time participates in the struggles of the autonomous culture forms.

Our great task then, is to work for the realisation of such a "form of Grace," which shall stand to modern society at once as judge, as an embodiment of its true meaning, and as the indication of its ultimate redemption. And the more completely we share the life of the historical period in which we find ourselves, the more fully we enter into the conflict and tension which it involves, the greater our contribution towards the coming of this "form of Grace" in which Christianity and the society of the future will enter on a new relationship.



## Jesus as a Radical.

By REINHOLD NIEBUHR.

There are two large classes of Christians who are a hindrance to a reorganisation of modern society in terms of the Christian ideal. The one consists of those who regard the possibility of a Christian society as hopeless, and the other is made up of the optimists who think that the task is fairly easy. In a very general way the Christians of the European continent belong in the first class and the Christians of the Anglo-Saxon world, more particularly the Americans, comprise the second class.

### Virtues and Vices of Religious Pessimism.

From the perspective of an English or American Christian the piety of Europe, and this refers particularly to German and French Protestantism, is too quietistic. Despairing of the world, it puts all of its emphasis upon the sentiment of Jesus "The Kingdom of God is within you." It prompts the sensitive soul to abandon the world to its own devices and to seek its peace and happiness not by fleeing into the monastery, as in the asceticism of the Middle Ages, but by escaping into the inner world of religious sentiment and experience. This type of piety has all the virtues and vices of religious pessimism. Americans, who have the naive optimism of a youthful people, are unable to see that pessimism may be a virtue, the virtue of a sensitive conscience. European Christians, on the other hand, find it difficult to realise how easily a religious pessimism may merely contribute to a further secularisation of society by its tendency to centre the attention of the sensitive conscience upon other than social problems. The difference between the two may be illustrated by a student conference of recent years in which a certain American religious leader pictured the evils of modern industrialism in China and ended his address by an appeal for men and money to bring a Christian social conscience to bear upon the new industrial problems of the Orient. One of the German students in the audience was so deeply affected by the tale of human injustice in the Orient that he regarded the practical appeal which ended the address as a trivial anti-climax. Before the evidence of such depths of human iniquity as had been

portrayed he thought nothing adequate but a religious service of repentance. The incident illustrates both the virtues and the weaknesses of the two types of Christians. Americans and Calvinistic Christians in general are quite prone to assume too easily that some little scheme will eliminate the social evils against which a Christian conscience reacts. On the European continent there is a general feeling that the Christians of the Anglo-Saxon world have in late years made a too easy identification of the Kingdom of God with the League of Nations. But on the other hand a religion which prompts men to throw up their hands in righteous despair is hardly more serviceable than a faith which is characterised by a fatuous optimism. In religion, as in all truth-seeking where the facts and the realities are complex, nothing is either true or false except in its proportion and its relation to other truths. Does the truth lie somewhere between these "European" and "American" positions? If we go back to Jesus for guidance and authority, can we discover any clue for a more fruitful position than either of these?

### **The Radicalism of Jesus.**

We are of course all familiar with the effort of every group to sanctify its own position by claiming the authority of Jesus. There are various elements in his position as we know it historically, and by a proper emphasis and lack of emphasis almost anything can be claimed for him. Henri Barbusse's recent life of Jesus is one interesting example of the many efforts which have been made to claim Jesus for the social revolutionists. In America some years ago Bouck White attracted attention by a similar attempt. Yet they can hardly be further from the truth than the efforts of complacent Christians to make Jesus the symbol of a life of harmless decency. The most flagrant effort of this type has recently achieved wide popularity in America in Bruce Barton's "The Man Nobody Knows."

My own opinion is that Jesus was a radical rather than either a revolutionist or a quietist. He was radical in the sense that Francis of Assisi was a radical and not after the manner of Henri Barbusse. If the pharisees crucified him because he opposed their oppression of the poor they also crucified him because he refused to participate in a revolt against the oppression of the Romans. His radicalism consisted in his realisation that the good life could not be achieved within the limits of conven-

tional society with its conventional corruptions of the highest moral values. He was much more critical of the possessive instinct than most of the conventional Christians who claim him as the authority of their particular type of decency. His warning "Take heed of all covetousness" and his advice to the rich young man "Sell all thou hast" are both typical of a thread of thought which runs through the whole gospel, and which Catholic asceticism has understood much better than most Protestant thought. It is at this point that the gulf between his thought and the dominant ideas of western civilisation yawns most widely. For western civilisation has identified happiness with the possession of things.

### **The Greater and the Lesser Loyalty.**

He was radical in his insistence that all loyalties to the immediate groups of man, the family, the race and the nation, must be subjected to the loyalty for the "kingdom" the beloved community in which love levels all distinctions. His words "Who so loveth father and mother more than me" and again "who are my brothers, mother and sisters" and his advice to the young man who urged preoccupation with a filial duty "let the dead bury their dead" seem unusually harsh, but are merely the rigorous application of this idea. His parable which describes the kingdom of God as the pearl of great price for which everything is sacrificed is another way of insisting that all lesser loyalties must be sacrificed for the one great loyalty. In comparison with this kind of absolute idealism all conventional Christian morality, which is forever sacrificing the interests of humanity to the special privileges and interests of families, races and nations is in strong contrast. It may not be too much to say that Jesus earned the enmity of the group of patriotic pharisees precisely because he was not a good patriot, at least not from their perspective. He could weep sympathetically over Jerusalem, but he also counselled the Jews to love their enemies, that is, the Romans. All this dissociates Jesus from the quietists who would attain the perfect life without disturbing social relationships and merely by withdrawing from the stubborn problems of society and appropriating the ideal in their inner life.

### **The Limits of Optimism.**

On the other hand it does not associate Jesus with the type of revolutionist who believes that a reorganisation of society



is the one necessary scheme for the attainment of the moral ideal, or with the optimistic evolutionists who think that all human society is inevitably and automatically approaching the ideal of "the Kingdom of God." It is true that Jesus compares the kingdom of God to the mustard seed and thereby implies that there will be a steady growth of the principle of love in human relationships. But on the other hand he was too good a realist to believe that brutal forces of human society would yield very easily to the power of love. He was in one sense more of a pessimist than an optimist, which means that he was, after the thought-forms of his day, an apocalyptic rather than an evolutionist. He saw the possibility of establishing a kingdom of love, but he knew that it would earn the enmity of the world, and he warned his disciples of the persecutions which they would have to endure. Yet his faith in God made it impossible for him to be a consistent pessimist, and as he approached the cross he predicted the final victory of the cause which would be momentarily defeated. I think that moderns who try to destroy the force of his apocalyptic notions are hardly in accord with history. He did seem to expect that final victory to come through an intervention of God in history. In that respect he was closer to the ideas of a cataclysmic change held by both premillinarians and communists than to those of the easy-going and complacent evolutionists. His ideas at this point may not be agreeable to the modern scientific mind, but they do justice to some facts in human life which evolutionary optimism does not easily recognise. Those facts are that the world of history is much more organically related to the world of nature than optimists believe, and that a life which incarnates the ideal can never be quite at home in human society. It must save its optimism by hoping for some kind of ultimate triumph and not by accepting small and momentary victories of the moral ideal as final. To do the latter invariably betrays religion into the sanctification of society's semi-decencies and equivocal moralities as the last word in Christian righteousness.

### **The Power of Love.**

However, it is just at this point that Jesus so easily becomes the justification for the position of the quietist. His "The kingdom of God is within you" is used as authority for the idea that the world belongs to the devil and that the righteous soul

can find peace only by letting the world take its course and fleeing to the asylum of mystical experience. If Jesus despaired of conquering the whole world by the power of love, he did not despair of the power of love. He believed that a kingdom of love could be established in history and time and he also knew that it could be done only at a tremendous price. In as far as the church is a religious fellowship which ostensibly accepts the principles of Jesus but does not use them to change actual human relations, to level the barriers of privilege and to substitute the power of love for the power of force, it is not in any sense the "kingdom of God." When a learned bishop during the late war was accused of radicalism because he had preached a sermon on the text "Blessed are the peacemakers" he defended himself by saying that his words had no political significance, and that he had used them only in "a religious sense." Sadly enough, that is the usual strategy of the church. It uses the principles of Jesus not to transform the world but to transcend it.

Modern Christians may not be able to use the exact technique of Jesus for escaping the perils of both an easy optimism and the enervation of a consistent pessimism. The apocalyptic ideas of his day can no longer serve us. But some substitute must be found for them. A conscience which imagines that the victory of the kingdom of love is just around the corner is not sensitive enough to the realities of life to be Christian. But a religious life which despairs of the final victory of the good is not sufficiently in touch with the spiritual realities of the world which guarantee this ultimate victory to be Christian. If we withdraw from the world it must be for the purpose of gaining a fulcrum from which we can bring the leverage of spiritual power to bear upon the world's life; if we try to transform the world we must beware of saving our faith by accepting some momentary achievement as the final victory. The true follower of Jesus must be radical without falling into despair, and morally active without claiming premature victories.

## Der Innere Mensch \*

*The editors of the "Student World" had asked Dr. Karl Barth to contribute an article for this number on the theme "The Christ of Faith". In declining this invitation Dr. Barth wrote the following letter, which he has been kind enough to allow the editors to publish :*

Münster i. W., 12. März 1928.

Sehr geehrter Herr Miller !

Sie waren so freundlich, mich zur Mitarbeit an der Julinummer der Zeitschrift "the Student World" einzuladen. Ich danke Ihnen bestens für das Vertrauen, muss Sie aber bitten, mir zu verzeihen, dass ich diesen Auftrag nicht übernehmen kann. Ich kritisiere niemanden, der der Meinung ist, mit der Veranstaltung eines solchen aus den verschiedenartigsten christlichen Stimmen zusammengesetzten Orchesterkonzertes etwas Gutes und Verheissungsvolles zu tun, oder dem es Freude macht, dabei mitzuwirken. Ich weiss, dass derartige Veranstaltungen heute in der Christenheit und sonst an der Tagesordnung sind und will gerne daran glauben, dass die Absichten dabei ernsthafte sind. Aber gerade die ernsthaften Vertreter dieser modernen Methoden werden auch Verständnis haben für die Besorgnis, es möchte durch solche Veranstaltungen der Anschein erweckt oder es möchte der schon vorhandene Anschein verstärkt werden :

1. Die Einheit der Christen in Christus sei eine Wirklichkeit, die durch eine Addition von möglichst vielen und verschiedenartigen christlichen Standpunkten sichtbar darzustellen ist.
2. Die christliche Wahrheit bestehe also in der Summe oder in dem Querschnitt der jeweiligen im Umlauf befindlichen christlichen Gedanken und Meinungen.
3. Die christliche Erkenntnis vollziehe sich also auf dem Weg einer Auswahl und gegenseitigen Abrundung zwischen diesen verschiedenen christlichen Ansichten.

Diesem Anschein, den ich für verhängnisvoll halte, möchte

\* Authorisierter Abdruck aus "Kom Schöpfer Geist" von Karl Barth und Ed. Thurneysen, Chr. Kaiser Verlag, München.



ich nicht dienen, indem ich meinen Namen und eine Aeussierung meiner Gedanken zu der beabsichtigten Stimmensammlung hergebe. Gerade wenn es so ist, wie Sie schreiben: dass meine Gedanken da und dort auch in Ihren Kreisen Eingang gefunden haben, könnten Alle die, die wissen, um was es mir geht, sich nur wundern darüber, mich in dieser Reihe auftauchen zu sehen. *Mein* Beitrag kann in diesem Fall nicht darin bestehen, dass ich 3000 Worte sage; sondern dass ich kein einziges Wort sage; das ist was ich ehrlicher Weise hier allein tun kann.

Fassen Sie es bitte nicht als Hochmut auf, dass ich Ihre Einladung nicht annehme, sondern glauben Sie mir, dass ich es persönlich gerne tun würde, wenn ich die Lage sachlich anders ansehen könnte. Wenn es Ihnen schwer fallen sollte, mich zu verstehen, so wird Ihnen gewiss Herr Dr. Adolf Keller, der, wie ich sehe, auch zu Ihren Mitarbeitern gehört, meinen Fall gerne etwas näher erklären und Ihnen sagen, dass ich kein böser Mensch bin.

Mit herzlichem Gruss  
Ihr sehr ergebener

Prof. D. KARL BARTH.

(Translation).

Münster i.W. 12th March 1928.

Dear Mr. Miller,

You have been good enough to ask me to contribute to the July number of your magazine the "Student World." I wish to express my thanks for this mark of confidence, but I must ask you to forgive me if I find it impossible to comply with your request. I should not wish to criticise anyone who hopes for valuable results from the arrangement of such a species of international orchestral concert, in which the most varied Christian points of view would play their part, nor would I criticise those who might find pleasure in taking part in it. I know that such undertakings are much in use to-day in Christian and other circles, and would willingly believe that the intentions of those who promote them are earnest and serious. But those who favour these modern methods will understand, if they are in earnest, the anxiety felt by others lest such undertakings should give rise to the impression, or strengthen it where it already exists:

1. That the unity of Christians in Christ is something actual, which can be visibly represented by adding together as many and as different Christian standpoints as possible.

2. That Christian truth consists in the sum total or in a cross-section of all the various Christian ideas and opinions.

3. That Christian knowledge is arrived at by means of a selection or mutual completion as between these various Christian points of view.

I consider such an impression disastrous, and should not wish to serve it by giving my name and the expression of my opinions to the collection which you are planning. If what you say is true, that my views have been accepted in certain places in your Movements, then all those who know what my real position is could only feel astonishment at seeing me appear in such company. My contribution cannot consist in this case in writing 3,000 words, but in not writing a single one; that is the only thing that I can honestly do for you.

I beg that you will not regard it as arrogance, if I refuse to comply with your invitation, but that you will believe that I personally would willingly do so, if only I could see the whole objective situation differently. If you should find it difficult to understand my point of view, I am sure that Doctor Adolf Keller, who, I see, is one of your contributors, would explain my position to you and assure you that there is no ill-will in me.

With kind regards,

Yours very sincerely,

KARL BARTH.

*Having failed to secure a statement from Dr. Barth, permission was obtained to publish a sermon from a book of sermons by Dr. Barth and Dr. Thurneysen, of Basle, which illustrates the point of view and the religious spirit of those who are associated with the Barthian Movement.*

---

2. Cor. 4, 16-18. Darum werden wir nicht mutlos, sondern wenn auch unser äusserer Mensch zerstört wird, so wird doch unser innerer Tag für Tag erneuert. Denn die augenblickliche leichte Bedrängnis schafft, Fülle um Fülle, eine ewige gewichtige Herrlichkeit, nämlich, die wir es nicht auf das Unsichtbare abgesehen haben. Denn das Sichtbare ist zeitlich, das Unsichtbare ist ewig.

Darum werden wir nicht mutlos! Das wollen wir heute gleich in einem ersten Sprung feststellen, von diesem Text

uns sagen lassen : Es gibt Menschen, die kennen zwar die Mutlosigkeit, sie kennen aber auch ein „Darum“ und ein „Nicht“, die sie der Mutlosigkeit bewusst und mit Erfolg entgegenstellen. Die Mutlosigkeit kennen wir jedenfalls auch. Wir wissen aber vielleicht noch nicht, dass die Mutlosigkeit nicht eine blossе Stimmung ist, gegen die man etwa aufkommen könnte, indem man versucht, sich anderen freundlicheren Stimmungen hinzugeben. Mutlosigkeit ist eine *Macht* in unserem Dasein, eine eherne Notwendigkeit in dieser Welt, und wenn wir ihr ein „Darum nicht“ entgegenstellen wollten, wie es Paulus in seinen Worten tut, dann müsste auch dieses „Darum nicht“ eine Macht sein, eine grössere, überlegene Macht, die die Macht der Mutlosigkeit zu Boden kämpft, eine Notwendigkeit, die härter ist als Erz und Stein, weil sie nicht aus dieser Welt kommt. Mutlosigkeit ist der Zustand, der über den Menschen kommt, wenn er sich klar wird über seine Lage als Mensch unter Menschen, als Mensch, der sterben muss und genau genommen jetzt schon im Sterben liegt, als Mensch in der Welt. Mutlosigkeit ist also eine direkte Folge der Wahrhaftigkeit, der Ehrlichkeit. Man kann es wohl verstehen, dass die meisten Menschen es vermeiden, wahrhaftig zu werden, ganz ehrlich sich einzugestehen, wie es mit ihnen und uns allen eigentlich steht. Sie fürchten mit Recht, das könnte sie mutlos machen. Das ist die Quelle aller menschlichen Beschränktheit und Einbildung. Man sagt, es sei für viele Menschen eine Wohltat, dass sie beschränkt oder eingebildet seien, und man dürfe sie in diesem Zustand nicht stören, weil sie sonst den Mut verlieren könnten. Wenn diese Wohltat nur grösser und wirksamer wäre ! Tatsächlich kann man ja der Mutlosigkeit nicht entfliehen, niemand kann es ganz. Sie drängt sich durch alle Poren und Ritzen zu uns herein. Denn das Leben ist nun einmal, wie es ist. Wer das nicht wissen will, der muss es mit der Zeit merken, spüren und erfahren, ohne es zu wissen, und dann kommt auch über ihn die Mutlosigkeit. Wir lächeln und lachen vielleicht noch, wir reden und gebärden uns vielleicht noch mit grosser Sicherheit und Zuversicht, aber das ist nur eine Wand, die wir gegen die eindringende, übermächtige Flut aufgestellt haben, und diese Wand ist nicht das „Darum nicht“ des Paulus, sie stammt aus dieser Welt, sie ist schon durchlöchert, indem wir sie bauen, und jenseits der Wand ist alles bereits unter Wasser.

Mutlos machen kann uns z.B. die Einsicht, dass wir alle nicht mit grossen, sondern mit sehr kleinen Dingen beschäftigt sind. Wir sind alle so dran, dass wir die Sehnsucht nach einer



grossen Wanderung in uns tragen und tatsächlich nur ein paar kleine Schritte im Kreis herum tun. Und darüber verstreicht unser Leben. Es kann uns mutlos machen, das einzusehen. Mutlos machen kann uns die Einsicht, dass in uns allen tief da unten etwas Unbelehrbares, Unbewegliches, Unerlöstes sitzt, mit starrem Gesichte wie ein chinesischer Götze. Das ist mein Besonderes, mein Ich, das was ich für mich bin, meine Persönlichkeit. Ein durchaus unerfreuliches Wesen, das uns alle überall und immer begleitet und aus allen unsern Worten und Taten herausguckt mit seinem Chinesengesicht. Ist es unser erbittertster Feind, oder ist es unser wirkliches, tiefstes Wesen ? Es kann uns jedenfalls mutlos machen, daran zu denken, dass es da ist. Mutlos machen kann uns die Erfahrung, dass auf unser aller Lebensweg auch äusserlich gewisse Klötze liegen, die nach menschlichem Ermessen nie davon verschwinden. Mutlos machen kann uns auch die Einsicht, dass nach einem alten Weisheitswort alles im Fluss ist in unserm Dasein ; der Gedanke daran, dass auch das Grösste und Schönste, was uns heute bewegt, einmal in seiner Einseitigkeit und Verirrung erkannt und blossgestellt werden wird ; der Gedanke daran, dass der Tag kommt, wo wir alle miteinander vergessen sein werden, als wäre es nie gewesen, was jetzt von Freude und Leid in uns brennt : Staat und Kunst, Wissenschaft und Kirche, Demokratie, Sozialismus und Völkerbund, religiöses Erleben und christlicher Aktivismus. Wenn die Gletscher wieder kommen ? Oder schon vorher : Wenn Asien mit seinem unergründlichen Geheimnis uns erdrückt oder Amerika mit seinem Geld uns kauft ? Da kann man wohl mutlos werden. Mutlosigkeit ist der Zustand, der aus der Einsicht kommt, dass unserer äusserer Mensch zerstört wird. Man könnte auch sagen : aus der Einsicht in die Herrschaft des *Todes*, unter der unser gesamtes Dasein steht. Wir müssten noch vieles nennen und beschreiben, was uns zu dieser Einsicht bringen muss, vor allem unsere Bedingtheit und Gefangenschaft als Mann und Weib. Wir wollen inne halten. Irgendwie sind wohl wir alle, ob wirs wollen oder nicht, bereits zu dieser Einsicht gebracht. Wir kennen alle, alle die Mutlosigkeit, da man die Hände sinken lassen und die Augen schliessen und mitten am Tage zur Nacht und mitten im Leben zum Tode Ja sagen möchte. Das Leben geht weiter, aber die Freude, der Glanz, die Hoffnung sind dahin. Die Erwartung und der Wille sind gestorben. Unzählige Menschen leben fast ganz in diesem Zustand, und etwas von diesem Zustand ist in uns allen. Und nun begegnet uns in den Worten des Paulus ein

Mensch, der kennt die Mutlosigkeit auch und spricht es scharf und ehrlich aus, wie es mit ihm und uns allen steht : „ Unser äusserer Mensch wird zerstört ! “ Er hat aber ein „ *Darum nicht* “, das er der Mutlosigkeit entgegenstellt, und das keine durchlöchernte Wand von Unehrllichkeit ist, sondern mit dem er, Macht gegen Macht, Härte gegen Härte, Notwendigkeit gegen Notwendigkeit, über die Mutlosigkeit triumphiert. Ein ehrlicher Mensch, aber ein triumphierender Mensch ! Auch wenn wir garnicht verstehen “ wie und warum ? ” Das ist ein Bild, ein Schauspiel, über das wir einmal staunen, an dem wir uns einmal erbauen müssen.

Was sagt Paulus ? Wir wollen ihm Wort für Wort zuhören. Er sagt zunächst : Unser äusserer Mensch wird zerstört, aber während und indem das geschieht, wird doch unser innerer Mensch Tag für Tag erneuert. Es ist wie alle derartigen Worte in der Bibel nicht nur so ein frommes Sprüchlein, wenn Paulus das sagt, sondern ein Wagnis, ein kühnes, hohes Greifen, ein Sieg in einem ganz unmöglichen Kampfe. Wir möchten denn doch fragen, ob das nur der äussere Mensch ist, dessen Zerstörung wir sehen müssen, wenn wir unser Leben ehrlich ansehen. Fragt sie einmal, alle die Ermüdeten und Enttäuschten unter uns, alle die an sich selbst irre geworden sind, die Kranken in den Spitälern und Anstalten, die verbitterten Familienväter und Familienmütter, fragt die, die heute nach allem, was geschehen ist, nichts anderes mehr erwarten als den Untergang unserer ganzen abendländischen Kultur, fragt euch selbst, ob das, was zerstört wird und dessen Zerstörung uns mutlos macht, nur der „ äussere “ Mensch ist ? Ist sie denn nur leiblich, nur körperlich, nur materiell, nur äusserlich : die Todesnot, in der sich der Mensch befindet ? O faule Tröster mit ihrem „ nur “, die uns damit Mut machen wollen, dass sie uns auf das Herz, den Geist, die Seele, das Innere verweisen wollen als auf das Gebiet, das von der Zerstörung nicht berührt werde. Leidet nicht auch das Herz, wenn die Glieder leiden, krankt nicht auch die Seele, wenn der Körper krank ist, stirbt nicht auch der Geist, wenn in der Tat Europa heute materiell zugrunde gehen sollte ? Ja, was ist alle äussere Not neben der inneren, in der wir uns befinden ? Ist nicht gerade die innere Zerstörung, die wir durchmachen, die eigentliche Quelle unserer Mutlosigkeit ? Nun, da können wir zunächst ganz ruhig sein : Paulus gehört nicht zu diesen faulen Tröstern. Wir brauchen uns bloss daran zu erinnern, dass er bei allem, was er da sagt, in Gedanken Christus vor sich hat, Christus am Kreuz mit seinem Ruf : Mein Gott,

mein Gott, warum hast du mich verlassen ? Und Paulus hat einmal seinen eigenen Zustand beschrieben mit den Worten : „ Auswendig Streit, inwendig Furcht “. Wer so redet, der beschwichtigt sich selbst und andere nicht damit, dass er sagt : Sei du nur getrost, liebe Seele, das ist alles nur äusserlich, und innerlich kann trotzdem alles in beste Ordnung kommen ! Nein, der weiss, dass die grosse Bedrängnis des Menschen auch innerlich, gerade innerlich, vor allem innerlich ist. Die Seele ist's, die dem Tode ins Gesicht sehen muss, die Seele ist's, die in Zerstörung begriffen ist. Wenn Paulus sagt : Der *äussere* Mensch wird zerstört, so ist darin wahrhaftig auch alles das *inbegriffen*, was wir *innerlich*, *geistig*, *seelisch* zu nennen gewöhnt sind. Es ist darin schlechthin alles inbegriffen, was wir menschlicherweise sind und haben, alles was wir menschlicherweise überhaupt erfahren und uns denken können. Paulus kennt nichts *in der Welt*, das von der Herrschaft des Todes ausgenommen wäre. Das ist's ja eben, was uns mutlos machen will, dass wir je länger um so mehr sehen müssen : In der Welt, gleichviel ob im Aeussern oder im Innern, gibt es keinen Winkel, wo nicht die Spuren des Todes schrecklich wahrnehmbar wären. Die ganze Welt, die wir kennen, meint Paulus, wenn er vom äussern Menschen redet. „ Mensch “ nennt er diese Welt, weil es die Welt der Menschen ist, weil es der Mensch ist, der in ihr den Tod als Tod erleidet, der ihre Zerstörung als etwas Mutraubendes, Ungehöriges, Schreckliches erleben und empfinden muss. Wenn wir vernehmen wollen, was Paulus vom *inneren* Menschen sagt, so müssen wir mit ihm *über die Welt hinaus*. Hinaus über das, was wir sind und haben, äusserlich und innerlich, hinaus über Körper und Seele, Natur und Geist. Wir müssen es wagen, mit ihm den Gedanken zu denken, den wir nicht denken können : den Gedanken *Gottes*. Der innere Mensch, von dem Paulus redet, er ist nicht etwa ein noch unbekannter Winkel der Welt, eine allerletzte Tiefe unserer Seele, die wir mit einer grössten Kraftanstrengung auch noch erreichen müssten, um daselbst endlich geborgen zu sein. Es ist das Andere an uns, das nicht mehr Welt ist, in keinem Sinne, die Tiefe *Gottes selbst*. Kein Arzt und kein Seelenarzt, kein Sozialpolitiker und kein Erzieher kann sie betreten, geschweige denn daselbst etwas ausrichten mit seinen Methoden. Keine Frömmigkeit, keine Tugend und keine Weisheit kann das Leben dieses inneren Menschen begründen, erhalten und vollenden. Kein Auge hat ihn gesehen, kein Ohr hat ihn gehört, in keines Menschen Herz und Erleben ist er gekommen. Sein Ort ist



genau die Grenze alles dessen, was wir denken, erfahren, tun und leiden können, dort fängt alles Unsrige an, dort hört es auf. Seine Zeit ist die Zeit, die keine Zeit ist, die Ewigkeit. Dort wo alles aufhört, dort fängt der innere Mensch an. Dort wo wir das, was wir „Leben“ nennen, verschwinden sehen im absoluten Geheimnisse des Todes, dort ist unser eigentliches Leben. Dort wo wir nichts mehr erkennen, wo wir sagen müssten, dass da nur noch Abgrund, Finsternis und Ende ist, da ist Gott zu erkennen. Und dort, sagt Paulus, dort ihr Müden, ihr Betrübten, ihr Erschrockenen, dort ereignet sich *auch* etwas, während sich die Zerstörung des äussern Menschen ereignet, die ihr jetzt vor Augen habt. Hier Ende, dort Anfang. Hier Abbruch, dort Aufbau. Hier Nein, dort Ja. Hier Tod, dort Leben. Hier Zerstörung, dort Erneuerung. Es wird dort Tag für Tag erneuert. Es fliesst dort eine Quelle. Es wird dort ein Anfang gemacht. Es findet dort ein Ursprung statt. Es wird dort ein Grund gelegt. Es wird dort Leben, Dasein, Wesen erschaffen aus dem Nichts. *Es ist dort Gott selbst.* Tag für Tag wird dort erneuert und wir könnten fortfahren: Stunde für Stunde, Minute für Minute. Keine Zeit ohne Ewigkeit. Keine Zerstörung hier ohne Erneuerung dort. Kein Altwerden, Schwachwerden, Sterben hier ohne Erschaffung neuen Lebens dort. Kein Fremder, Ferner, Unbekannter ist ja unser innerer Mensch, der aus Gott Geborene, ewig Lebendige, wir selbst sind es, gerade weil er mehr ist als wir selbst, gerade weil wir selbst mit ihm anfangen und aufhören. Immer und überall ist das Dort verborgen hinter dem Hier. Das Dort ist nur die andere Seite, die Gottesseite des Hier. Der innere Mensch in seiner Erneuerung ist nur die andere Seite, die Gottesseite des äusseren Menschen in seiner Zerstörung. Wir selbst sind es, mit denen es sich ereignet, dass wir erneuert werden. Denn dieser innere Mensch, das sind wir. Die Tiefe Gottes selbst, das ist die Wahrheit des Menschen. In *unser* traurig-wahres Altwerden hinein leuchtet und tönt das noch wahrere Neu, Neu, Neu! *Unser* Tod wird verschlungen vom Leben. Unser ehrliches Nein wird aufgehoben und umgekehrt ins Ja. „Was hier kränkelt, seufzt und fleht, wird dort frisch und herrlich gehen; irdisch werd' ich ausgesät, himmlisch werd' ich auferstehen“. Seht, das ist das Wagnis, das kühne Greifen, der Sieg, der in diesen Worten liegt. Wir spüren es ja ohne weiteres: Das ist ein Wagnis, den unerhörten Gedanken Gottes zu denken über die Welt hinaus, dort anzufangen, wo alles aufhört, dort Ja zu sagen, wo wir nur Nein hören, dort vom Leben zu reden, wo man sonst Tod sagt, von dort alles zu erwarten,

wo man sonst nichts mehr erwartet. Das *ist* ein Wagnis, dort zu setzen und zu sagen: „es ist!“, wo alles und jedes „es ist“ unmöglich ist. Das *ist* ein Wagnis, Hier und Dort, dieses ach so wohlbekannte Hier und dieses ach so unbekannte Dort zusammen zu fassen wie mit einer eisernen Klammer und nun das ganze Hier von dem verborgenen, überlegenen Dort aus zu begreifen. Das *ist* ein Wagnis, sich selbst und den Menschen zu sagen: „Das Dort ist dem Hier *überlegen*, gerade der innere Mensch ist in *Wahrheit* der Mensch und darum, darum weil das der Mensch ist, *darum* werden wir nicht mutlos“. Nein, das ist kein frommes Sprüchlein, das ist nicht natürlich, nicht selbstverständlich, das pflückt man nicht vom Baum, das ist ein *Wagnis*. In diesem Wagnis ist die Macht, die Paulus der Mutlosigkeit entgegenstellt.

Und nun müssen wir noch etwas hören. Wir könnten ja nun fragen, wie kommt ein Mensch dazu, dieses „Darum nicht“ so in die Hand zu nehmen und der Mutlosigkeit entgegenzustellen. Paulus gibt eine sehr merkwürdige Antwort. Er sagt nicht: *Die Bedrängnis schafft die Herrlichkeit*. Denkt, was das sagen will: Gerade was mich gefangen nimmt, befreit mich. Gerade was mich tötet, macht mich lebendig. Gerade durchs Nein komme ich zum Ja. Gerade das Ende brauche ich zum Anfangen. Gerade die Zerstörung des äussern Menschen muss sein zur Erneuerung des innern. Er würde uns also z.B. sagen: „Ja, begreife nur, wie klein das ist, was du tust und tun musst! Begreife nur, wie unerlöst und unerfreulich dein Ich ist! Begreife nur den Klotz auf Deinem Weg in seiner furchtbaren Tatsächlichkeit! Begreife nur, dass alles fließt und vergeht! Begreife nur den „Untergang des Abendlandes!“ Begreife und *sei* bedrängt und *lass* dich bedrängen! Die Bedrängnis schafft die Herrlichkeit. Sie nimmt dir, was dir genommen werden muss. Sie erweckt Zweifel und Fragen in dir, die einmal in dir erwachen *müssen*. Sie tötet, was sterben muss. Du bist ja noch nicht dort, wo alles aufhört, noch nicht dort, wo du nur an Gott selbst denken kannst, noch nicht vor dem Unmöglichen, noch nicht am Ende, wo die neue Welt anfängt. Du hast die Grenze noch nicht erreicht, wo das Leben anfängt. Die Bedrängnis *schafft* die Herrlichkeit, indem sie dich an die Grenze drängt. Dein innerer Mensch *braucht* die Bedrängnis. Das ist eine unermessliche Einsicht. Es ist, wie wenn im Kriege Geschütze erobert und sofort feindwärts gekehrt werden. Was mich mutlos machen wollte, das muss mich jetzt nicht nur in Ruhe lassen, das macht mich jetzt mutig. Es ist nicht nur „augenblicklich und leicht“

geworden; seine Kraft abzureissen, Zweifel und Fragen zu wecken, in die Enge zu treiben, zum äussersten zu bringen, zu töten, diese Kraft muss mir nun dienen. Ich freue mich darüber, bedrängt zu sein: Ich will nichts anderes als bedrängt sein. Bedrängnis schafft, Fülle um Fülle, Herrlichkeit, ewige, gewichtige Herrlichkeit.

Aber nichtwahr, das alles können und wollen wir nicht ohne weiteres und einfach nachsagen. Wir wollen uns nicht einbilden, als ob wir es ohne Frage, etwa kraft einer plötzlichen Erleuchtung oder eines freien Entschlusses könnten. Wenn etwas heute aufhören muss, so ist es die religiöse Anmassung und Ueberheblichkeit, die sich erlaubt, was Propheten, Apostel und Reformatoren sagen durften, ohne den Beweis des Geistes und der Kraft einfach nachzusagen. Wer sind die, die so reden können, bei denen es wahr ist, wenn sie so reden? Paulus sagt es: „Wir, die wir es nicht auf das Sichtbare, sondern auf das unsichtbare abgesehen haben“, weil wir wissen: „Das Sichtbare ist zeitlich, das Unsichtbare ist ewig“. Es bedeutet eine Wendung, eine Umkehrung unseres Lebens, deren wir uns nicht zu rasch fähig erklären wollen, wenn wir sagen können, dass wir es auf das Unsichtbare abgesehen haben. Die Meisten auch von denen, die meinen, sie täten das, würden tötlich erschrecken, wenn man ihnen sagen würde, was das ist, *das Unsichtbare*! Den Gedanken Gottes denkt man nicht jedesmal, wenn man „ergriffen“ ist. Es fragt sich, von was wir ergriffen sind. Wir wollen uns lieber offen gestehen, dass wir es im ganzen auch in unseren Ergriffenheiten durchaus auf das *Sichtbare* abgesehen haben und darum dann auch im Ganzen jenes „Darum nicht“ *nicht* haben, um es der Mutlosigkeit entgegenzustellen. Wenn wir es hätten, wir würden samt und sonders andere Gesichter machen, und es würde in der Welt sehr anders aussehen. Es ist uns besser, wenn wir den Abstand zwischen uns und der Bibel wahrnehmen. Wir wollen uns damit begnügen, zu hören, dass es Menschen gibt, die der Mutlosigkeit zum Trotz mutig leben wie jener Ritter auf dem Bilde von Albrecht Dürer: zwischen Tod und Teufel. Wir wollen uns klar machen: Darum handelt es sich eigentlich im Christentum, das ist's, was dem Paulus durch *Christus* widerfahren ist, dass er sein Absehen auf das Unsichtbare haben konnte, musste und wollte. Die totale Wendung des Lebens in der Richtung auf das Unsichtbare, das ist das „Christentum.“ Daraus fliesst der Mut, sicher, unbedingt, grenzenlos. Der innere Mensch ist mutig. Aber er muss erwachen in uns, nicht schlafen, wenn uns das etwas helfen soll. Vielleicht



leuchtet und blitzt schon etwas in uns vom Absehen auf das Unsichtbare. Vielleicht zuckt es manchmal wie eine Ahnung durch unseren ganzen äusseren Menschen von seiner andern Seite her : „ Das Sichtbare ist zeitlich, das Unsichtbare ist ewig ! “ Vielleicht träumt unser innerer Mensch, als ob er bald erwachen wollte. Wie sollte es unmöglich sein : Wir haben den undenk- baren Gedanken Gottes vielleicht auch schon gedacht. Wohlan, was wir kennen und haben an Licht und Barmherzigkeit in unserm Leben, an Gnade und Wahrheit in der Welt, das ver- danken wir diesem Vielleicht, diesem Wenigen, in welchem wir an der Seite des Paulus „ in Christus “ sind. Wie wird es erst sein, wenn das Vielleicht zur Gewissheit, das Wenige zum Vielen wird !

# The Inward Man.

*(Translation)*

For which cause we faint not ; but though our outward man perish yet the inward man is renewed day by day. For our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory. While we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen : for the things which are seen are temporal ; but the things which are not seen are eternal. (2 Cor. IV, 16-18.)

For which cause we faint not ! That then is the first thing for us to realise and learn from this text ; — that men and women exist who, though they know what faintness of heart is, know too of a “ for which cause ” and a “ not ” which they consciously and successfully oppose to this faint-heartedness. We too know what it is to be faint of heart. But perhaps we have not yet learned that faint-heartedness is no mere mood, against which we can make head by endeavouring to induce in ourselves a happier frame of mind. Faintness of heart is a power in our existence, an iron necessity in this world of ours, and if we would oppose to it, in the words of Paul a “ for this cause... not ” then this “ cause ” must be also a power, a greater, superior power, which shall crush down the power of our faint-heartedness, a necessity harder than bronze or stone, because it is not of this world. Faintness of heart is the state which comes over a man when he realises his condition as a man among men, as a man who must die, who, strictly speaking, has already begun to die — as a man in the world. Faintness of heart is then a direct consequence of sincerity and honesty of thought. It is easy to understand that most men shrink from this sincerity, from avowing quite openly to themselves what their position and the position of all of us really is. They fear, and rightly fear, that to do so might make them faint of heart. From this root springs all human narrowness and conceit. It may be said that it is for many men a happy thing that they are narrow and conceited, and that we should not disturb them in this blessed state, lest they should lose heart. If only this happiness were completer and more lasting ! In reality however we cannot thus escape from faint-heartedness ; no one can do so altogether. It creeps in upon us through all the pores of our skin, through every tiny wound. For life is once for all what it is. Whoever seeks to escape from that fact, will learn it in time, feel it and experience

it, though he may not realise that he is doing so, and then faintness of heart will come upon him. We may smile and laugh, we may talk and act with great sureness and confidence, but that is but a wall which we strive to set up against the oncoming, almighty flood, and this wall is not the "For which cause" of Paul; it is of this world, it is pierced through even as we build it, and all beyond is already under water.

We may lose heart, for instance, when we see that the things with which we are all occupied are not great things, but very small. We are all so made that we long for some great voyage of discovery, and all we can do is to go a few steps round in a circle. And so our life passes away. To realise that, may make us faint of heart. Or we may grow faint-hearted when we see that in all of us, deep down, there is something unteachable, unalterable, unredeemed, something fixed, immovable as a heathen image. That is our peculiar self, our ego, what we are to ourselves, our personality, — an utterly unpleasing being who follows us everywhere and always, and whose set mask peeps out in all our words and deeds. Is it our most deadly enemy or our most essential, our deepest self? In any case, the thought of its presence may well make us faint of heart. We may grow faint-hearted at the knowledge that along the life's road of all of us there lie certain obstacles, which humanly speaking can never be removed. Or when we realise that, as an old word of wisdom has it, everything in our existence is in a state of ebb and flow, that what appeals to us to-day as utmost greatness and beauty will some day be laid bare before us in all its one-sidedness and error; that the day will come when we shall all be forgotten, as though the joy and sorrow which lives in us had never been — church and state, science and art, democracy, socialism and League of Nations, religious experience and Christian social service. What when the ice age returns? Or before then — what when Asia with her impenetrable mystery overwhelms us, or America buys us with her gold? Such thoughts may well make us faint of heart. Faintheartedness is the condition which springs from the realisation that our outward man is perishing. We might also say that it springs from the realisation of the sovereignty of *death*, to which our whole existence is subject. Many more things could be enumerated, which must inevitably bring us to this realisation, above all, our bondage and our dependence as man and woman. But let us rather be silent. In one way or another all of us, whether we wish it or not, have already reached this pass. We all of us, every one, know what it is to be faint of heart, to fold our hands



and close our eyes and in the day-time to see but the night and in the midst of life to long for death. Life goes on, but joy, glamour, hope are no more. Expectation and will are dead within us. Countless men and women live almost entirely in this state, and something of this state is in us all. And now in the words of Paul we meet with a man who knows what it is to be faint of heart, and speaks out boldly and clearly how it is with him and with us all: "Our outward man perishes!" But he has a "For this cause... not" with which to combat our faintness of heart, and this no broken wall of insincerity, but rather by power against power, by hardness against hardness, by necessity against necessity, he overcomes the faintness of heart in us. A sincere man, but a triumphant man! Even if we do not understand how and why this may be, it is yet a spectacle which we must view with astonishment, from which we must draw inner strength.

What then does Paul say? Let us take him word for word. First of all he says: Our outward man perishes, but whilst that is happening, and because it is happening, our inward man is renewed day by day. Like all other similar sayings in the Bible, what Paul says here is not merely a pious maxim, but a daring venture, a bold and lofty out-reach of the spirit, a victory in a battle which seems hopelessly lost. For we might well ask if it is only our *outward* man whose destruction we contemplate when we look with clear-eyed vision at our life. Ask them all, the weary and disillusioned amongst us, all those who have lost faith in themselves, the sick in body and mind in our hospitals and institutions, the embittered fathers and mothers of families, ask those who to-day, after all that has happened, look forward only to the perishing of our Western civilisation, ask yourselves whether that which is being destroyed, and whose destruction makes us faint of heart, is but the "outward" man? Is it then only of the body, only material, only external, the death agony in which humanity is lying? Oh feeble comforters with their "only", who would give us courage by pointing to the heart, the spirit, the soul, the inner self as the region untouched by destruction. Does not the heart suffer when the limbs suffer, is not the soul sick with the sickness of the body, will not the spirit die, if indeed Europe is destined to speedy material ruin? Nay, what is all outer suffering as compared to the inward misery in which we are all plunged? Is not the inward destruction through which we are all passing the very root of our faintness of heart? Well, we may be quite reassured about that; Paul is

not one of these feeble comforters. We have only to remember that in all that he says here, he has before him Christ, Christ on the Cross with His cry of despair "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" And Paul once described his own condition in the words: "Without were fightings, within were fears." The man who speaks thus will not attempt to sooth himself or others by saying: "Take comfort, my soul, that is all only outward; inwardly everything may be all for the best!" It is the soul that must look death in the face; it is the soul that is in process of destruction. When Paul says: our outward man perishes, he includes all that we are in the habit of calling inward, spiritual, the soul. He includes absolutely everything which as human beings we are and have, all that as human beings we can know by experience or thought. Paul knows nothing *in this world* which is exempt from the lordship of death. That is just what drives us to despair, that the longer we live the more clearly we see that in this world there is no smallest spot, whether without us or within, in which the signs of death are not to be seen in all their terror. It is the whole world as we know it that Paul means, when he speaks of our outward man. He calls this world "man" because it is the world of men, because it is man who in it suffers death as death, to whom its destruction comes as something terrifying, portentous, robbing him of all courage. If we would hear what Paul says of the *inward* man, then we must go with him *beyond the bounds of this world*, — beyond all that we have and are, outwardly *and* inwardly, beyond body *and* soul, nature *and* spirit. We must dare to follow him to the thought that is beyond our thought, the thought of *God*. The inward man of whom Paul speaks is not some hitherto undiscovered spot in the world, some final unexplored depth of our souls, to which with utmost exertion we might perhaps attain, to find at length security there. It is that *other* in us, which is no longer of this world, in no sense of this world, the depth of *God Himself*. No doctor and no psychotherapist, no sociologist and no educationalist can penetrate to it, or accomplish anything there by the means at his disposal. No piety, virtue or wisdom can serve to found, to maintain and to perfect the life of this inward man. No eye has seen him, no ear has heard him, into the heart and experience of no man has he entered. His dwelling-place is beyond the limits of all our thought, our experience, our doing and our suffering; there all that is ours begins and ends. His time is the timeless time which is Eternity. There, where all comes to an end, the inward man begins. There, where all that we call "Life" vanishes

in the utter mystery of death, our true life lies. There where our perception fails, there where we would say that all was but chaos, darkness and the end, there we perceive God. And there, says Paul, there, ye weary, ye sorrowful, ye terror-stricken, there *too* something is happening whilst the outward man is being destroyed before your eyes. Here is the end, there the beginning; here a breaking-down, there a building-up; here negation, there affirmation; here death, there life; here destruction, there renewal. There is renewing day by day; there the springs of life flow; there a beginning is being made; there fresh life is coming to birth; there foundations are being laid. There life, existence, being, are in the process of creation from nothingness. *There is God Himself.* There, day by day there is renewing — we might add, hour by hour, minute by minute. There is no time without eternity; no destruction here without renewal there; no growing old and weak and dying here, without the creation of new life there. Our inward man is no stranger, distant and unknown; he is born of God, ever-living; he is ourselves, just because he is more than ourselves, because we ourselves begin and end with him. Ever and always the There is hidden behind the Here. The There is but the other side, God's side, of the Here. Our inward man in his renewal is but the other side, God's side, of the outward man in his destruction. It is we ourselves who undergo the process of renewal, for this inward man is ourselves. The depth of God Himself is the true essence of man. Into the midst of our sorrowful growing old comes the light and the music of a deeper truth: New, new, new! *Our* death is swallowed up in life. *Our* honest "No" is annulled and transformed into "Yes." Yes, that is the daring venture, the bold and lofty outreach of the spirit, the victory that is contained in these words. We feel it immediately, it *is* a venture to send our thought out beyond the world to the unheard-of thought of God, to begin where all leaves off, to affirm where we hear but denial, to speak of life where we know but of death, to expect all, where we are wont to expect nothing. It *is* a venture to postulate life and assert "It is" where all existence ceases to be possible. It *is* a venture to clamp together as with an iron band the Here and the There, the too well-known Here and the altogether unknown There, and so to grasp the meaning of all that is Here through the hidden, higher truth of the There. It is indeed a venture to say to ourselves and to our fellow-men: "That which is There is *higher* than that which is Here; the inward man is the *true* man, and for this cause, because that is the true man, *therefore*, we faint not." No, that is no pious maxim, that is no natural thing,



that does not come of itself, that is a *venture*. And in this venture lies the power with which Paul combats faintness of heart.

And now there is something further. We may ask, how did a human being come to seize upon this "For this cause... not" and oppose it to our faint-heartedness? Paul gives a very remarkable answer to this question. He does not say "If we are religious, we can do this!" He does not say "My power is in my faith" or anything of that sort. He says: "The affliction worketh for us the glory." Think what that means; that very thing which binds me, sets me free; that which kills me, gives me life; through negation I come to affirmation; the end brings me to the beginning. The destruction of the outward man must come in order that the inward man may be renewed. He would say to us, for example: "Yes, see clearly how small a thing it is that you are doing, and must do, how unredeemed and unpleasing your Ego! See clearly the obstacles on your path in all their terrible reality; see that all things ebb and flow and pass away; see the breakdown of western civilisation. See it all, and be afflicted by it and let yourself be afflicted, for the affliction worketh for us the glory! It takes from you what you must lose; it awakens in you doubts and questionings that must be awakened; it kills that which must die. You are not yet arrived there where all things leave off, there, where you can think but of God alone; you have not yet reached the impossible, you are not yet at the end, where the new world commences; you have not yet come to the limit where life begins. The affliction worketh the glory, because it drives you to that last limit; your inward man has need of the affliction. That is an extraordinary perception; it is like the capture of artillery in war and the turning of it at once against the foe. That which was to make me faint of heart does not merely leave me unshaken; it gives me new courage. It has not merely become "light" and "for a moment;" its power to unman me, to awaken in me doubts and questionings, to destroy me — that very power must now do me service. I rejoice in my affliction. I desire no other than to be afflicted. For the affliction worketh a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.

But we cannot and we would not accept and repeat all this without further thought. We must not imagine that it is in our power to do so unquestioningly, as if by a sudden illumination or a free resolve. If there is anything which is to be condemned in the religious life of to-day, it is that arrogance and presumption which shows itself in repeating the words of the prophets,

apostles and reformers without any demonstration of their spirit or their power. Who are they who can speak so, with whom it is truth when they so speak? Paul tells us: "We who look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen," for we know "the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal." It means a turning-point, a re-direction of our whole lives, of which we must not too readily declare ourselves capable, if we are to be able to say that we look to the things which are not seen. Most even of those who think that they do this, would be filled with terror if they should learn the true meaning of the things which are not seen. It is not given to us to reach with our thought to the thought of God every time that we are "seized." The question is by what we are "seized." Let us rather confess openly to ourselves that even in our moments of seizure our thoughts are directed rather to the things which are seen, and that therefore we do not attain to that "For which cause... not" with which alone we may combat our faintness of heart. If we did so, we should, one and all of us, look out on the world with very different eyes, and the world itself would be a very different place. It is better for us that we should be conscious of the gulf which separates us from the Bible. Let us be content to know that men and women exist who, in defiance of faintness of heart, live out their lives with courage betwixt death and the devil, like the knight in Albrecht Dürer's picture. Let us be clear with ourselves that the real essence of Christianity, that which came to Paul through Christ, is this, that we can, must and will look to the things which are not seen. The turning of the whole of life towards the invisible — that is Christianity. Thence comes courage, sure, absolute, boundless. The inward man is courageous. But he must be awake in us, not asleep, if help is to come to us. Perhaps we have some dim glimpse, some fleeting vision, of what it means to look to the things which are not seen; perhaps there flashes through our whole outward man, as from his other side, some intuition of the truth: "The things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal." Perhaps our inward man dreams, as if he would soon awake. How should that be impossible? Perhaps our thought has already reached out to the unthinkable thought of God. So be it, for whatever we have of light and mercy in this our life, of grace and truth in this our world, we owe to this "perhaps," to that little power we have to stand by Paul's side "in Christ." How shall it be, then, when that "perhaps" becomes a certainty, when that "little" becomes "great"?

# Am I a Christian?\*

By MAHATMA GANDHI.

It has been a great pleasure and a matter of privilege to me to find myself in close touch, which is growing closer, with my Christian friends not merely in India, but I might almost say, throughout the world. Some of my Christian friends will not even take my flat denial when I tell them that I am not a Christian. And those of you who are familiar with the pages of "Young India" may know something of what I am obliged to say from time to time in connection with the inquiry of so many earnest Christian friends.

## A Distorted Christianity — "Not This"

I feel that it will be perhaps better this evening to take a few minutes of our time in telling you where I really stand. It is a difficult thing and it is also an easy thing. So far as I myself am concerned, as I have said elsewhere, I believe in the message of Jesus as I understand it in "the Sermon on the Mount" unadulterated. My own humble interpretation of the message is in many respects different from the orthodox interpretation. I was given, when I was in Errawada Jail, a reasoned long letter addressed to their flock by the clergy. There they had given what I suppose must be considered an authoritative interpretation of "the Sermon on the Mount". When I was prematurely discharged from jail Charlie Andrews, than whom on this earth I do not own a closer friend, met me whilst I was convalescing at Juhu and placed another copy of this letter in my hands and asked me to deal with it. But I never found the time to do so, as something or other always cropped up which prevented me from undertaking the task that was imposed upon me by those friends. That letter lies buried in my papers and now I do not suppose that I shall even want to give my own answer to that letter. Nor do I propose this evening to go into the thing. But as pressing letters and inquiries even now continue to pour in upon me to explain what

\* This article is reprinted from "Ceylon Men" the organ of the Y.M.C.A. in Ceylon and also appeared in the "Sphere" for April, 1928. The Editors of the "Student World" are responsible for the title.



I mean and where I stand, I thought that I would at this meeting take the opportunity of telling you the secret of how I stand and where my position lies. In my humble opinion the message of Jesus has suffered distortion in the West. It is a presumptuous thing I know on my part to say this thing before an audience of this character. But you will understand and appreciate my difficulty. When one finds oneself pressed on all sides by friends and critics, friendly and otherwise, in spite of one's great reluctance one is driven to coming out with the truth. I know that as a devotee of truth I should never hesitate to speak it out. In my diligent search after truth I have also come to see that to speak one's mind is not always relevant, that the world is not always eager to listen to what you might have to say. The world very often does not even care what you think or you don't think, and so I know that my telling you or telling anybody where I stand in connection with Christianity or any other faith is no concern of yours, no concern even of an audience like this. One's own religion is, after all, a matter between one's own self and one's own maker and no one else. But if I feel impelled and compelled to share this with you this evening it is because I want to enlist your sympathy in my search. I want to enlist your sympathy also for the cause for which I am living and for which I should love to die. Perhaps I cannot enlist your sympathy as well as I might if I don't lay all my cards on the table and let you understand what is at the back of my mind, in front of it, and on all sides of it, and so I thought that at this meeting I would just tell you where I stood. If then I am to face only the "Sermon on the Mount" and my own interpretation of it, I should unhesitatingly say, "Oh, Yes, I am a Christian". But I know that if at the present moment I said anything of such a nature, I should lay myself open to the grossest misinterpretation. I should lay myself open to a fraudulent claim, because I would have then to tell you my own meaning of Christianity. And I have no desire whatsoever to give you my own view of Christianity, but negatively I can tell you this much, that what to-day passes for Christianity is a negation of the "Sermon on the Mount". And please mark my words, I am not at the present moment concerned with Christian conduct. I am not at the present moment laying stress upon official Christianity, but upon what I have understood to be the content of Christianity as it is understood in the West apart from conduct. I am painfully aware of the fact that conduct falls short even of written profession, but I do not say this by way of criticism. I know, from my own

treasured experience, that my own conduct, trying as I am every moment of my life to live up to my profession, falls short of that profession. Far be it from me, therefore, to say this in any spirit of criticism. But I am placing before you these fundamental difficulties of mine. Some of you at least know that I have devoured Christian literature since 1891 or more fully since 1893, when fate cast me in the midst of those very fine Christians who belonged to the South African General Mission, where I saw Wesleyans, Presbyterians and a Quaker couple. I saw also some of the Plymouth Brethren. So you will understand that I had varied experience and they piled book upon book upon me. I was unprepared for this onslaught, but having been faithful to my friends, wanting always to accomodate friends, being always in need of accomodation myself, and, therefore, wanting also to please them if I could, I read those books for their sakes. It was, therefore, to me not a task but a pleasure that the thought of my reading those books prayerfully gave those friends of mine pleasure and satisfaction. So I read them and I had ample leisure then, of which I have none to-day, for such reading. I used to go out into the beautiful South African veldt unaccompanied by a single human being and there I used to read those books steadily. Then in the evenings, especially on Sundays, we all met under the hospitable roof of a Miss Harris belonging to this Mission. I used to place these difficulties before them. I read those books with the help, the powerful help of those friends. I went on, and they were pilots endeavouring to pilot me through, the shoals and dangerous rocks that lay ahead. They were always taking their soundings and asking me "Where are you now?" To this day that question has been addressed to me time after time, and I have been obliged to say in the words of the Vedas "Nithi, Nithi" the literal meaning of which is "Not this, not this". I have been obliged to say "Not this, not this. If this be Christianity, not this, not this." The deepest thing in me tells me that I am right.

### One Truth and Many Voices.

I claim in all humility to be a man of prayer. For if I was cut up into pieces I think that God would give me strength not to deny Him, strength to assert that He is. This does not take us very far, for the Musulman says: "God is," and that He alone is. In Christian opinion, idolatrous as we may be described, the Hindu says the same thing. And if I may speak of the

Buddhist, I say in all humility that even he says the same thing. But unconsciously we all have a different meaning for this statement. A different interpretation of God, who embraces not only this fiery globe of ours, of which we know so horribly little, but of God who embraces millions of such globes of which we cannot even have a vague conception. We little crawling creatures, so utterly helpless as He has made us, how can we possibly measure His greatness, His strength, His boundless love, His compassion such that it allows a man who insolently denies His very existence to live, which allows men to wrangle about Him, which even allows men to cut the throats of their fellowmen, so forgiving, so divine, so compassionate is He.

Therefore, I understand that after all each one has his own particular religion. When these very names, Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism may be blotted out — we may know these names by some other names — even then there will be that unwreckable bond between the Creator and the creature.

I ask every Christian friend of mine to make his own search. Let him square his own accounts with His Maker and let him leave me to square mine. I have also come to this conclusion, which is forcing itself upon me day after day, that if we will but recognise in all humility our limitations, we can come to the conclusion that we have each one of us one pupil too many, one soul too many to take care of, and that is our own selves. If we would but mind our own hearths, our own selves, place that house in order, use the body that is given to us for higher ends in the few years which are but moments and less than moments, in this huge great eternal time; if we would therefore make proper use of this body and treat it not as a receptacle for putting in all the rubbish that finds its way into it, but use it as the temple for God to reside in and for God to sit there on his throne and say, "You are a good door-keeper, you are guarding the entrance well," I say that we shall have done our duty and we, whether Hindus, Musulmans, Christians, Buddhists, Parsis or Jews, will have lived our life in full measure and God will be pleased with our conduct. That being so, I have urged upon my Christian missionaries who have come to the East to live their religion, to let it speak for itself. That to my mind will be the truest form of proselytising, that will be the truest form of *Suddhi* and then there will be no distrust, no suspicion, no quarrel, no wrangling.

### A Warning to the West.

My mind, as I am talking to you this evening, and lay my heart bare before you, goes to China. I do not know that land, I wish I could help, but I cannot help. I have met several Chinese in Johannesburg. I have great regard for that great and ancient people and I think that they have yet a mission not merely for their own country, but for us. A Christian friend only the other day sent me a little pamphlet. It was prepared by the student departments of the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. in China. It is a recent publication and I think that it is intended principally for circulation amongst their Christian friends. It has been circulated in India also and as I am in touch with almost all Christian bodies now in India, and it is a special privilege I prize, I had this book passed on to me also. There are chapters written by very earnest, probably distinguished, Chinese young men, and each one has given his own reading of the hidden meaning of the movement that is going on in that country which is in the throes of a new birth. These writers have sought to put before their friends their own interpretation upon the unity of the anti-Christian movement, which has also cropped up in China. So far as I have gone through it, they say : " Do not consider this movement anti-Christian, it is against anti-nationalistic tendencies, inasmuch as Young China regards with disfavour any movement, any action or any person opposed to Chinese self-expression ". They are down upon it, and I think that these young men who write say also that there is considerable justification for it.

The truth or the deduction that I would like all to draw from this manifestation that is taking place in China is that those of you who are Ceylonese must not be impatient, and those of you who are from the West must not consciously or unconsciously lay violent hands upon the manners, habits and customs of the East in so far as they are not repugnant to or inconsistent with the fundamentals. I plead with you, let not the people of the East confuse the teaching of Jesus with what passes as modern civilisation or ancient civilisation. It is, I know, in the majority of cases unconscious, but all the same it is an unconscious violence done to the people in whose midst you cast your lives in obedience, I admit, to the voice of conscience, or as you will put it, the call of God. Let it be in obedience to that, but is it part of that call to tear the lives of the people of the East by their roots ? Tolerate whatever is good. Beware of your preconceived notions. Do not judge lest you may be judged yourselves. In spite of your belief



in western civilisation, in spite of your achievements in modern science, in which we cannot possibly imitate you, I plead with you for humility, and I ask you to leave some little room for doubt. After all, I think there was some truth in what Tennyson said in the last two lines of his "In Memoriam." I know that this is said of a different thing, but I am using that expression for my own purpose here, and if you will just a little doubt the reality of these achievements, — I know that you do not claim permanence for these achievements, — then if you will come with that prayerful doubt and say that what these men are doing may be right, let us see; if yours is the right life, yours is the right message, where is there any cause for hurry or waste? You live your lives in their midst and your lives speak for themselves.

### **An Appeal to the East.**

To all the young men before me, to the Ceylonese friends, I say, do not be dazzled by the splendour that comes to you from the West. Do not be taken off your feet by this passing show. The Enlightened One has told you in never-to-be-forgotten words, in his memorable words, that this little span of life is but a passing shadow, the fleeting thing, and, if you will realise the nothingness of all that appears before your eyes, the nothingness of the material world that we see before us, ever changing, then indeed there are treasures for you, there is peace and happiness for you to which we on this earth are utter strangers. It requires an amazing faith, a divine faith to surrender all that we see before us, and for what? for the search of a mere shadow, a mere nothing. You may put it that way, or you may say as did the great Buddha, when he had ample powers and a great kingdom growing under his very feet, a beautiful and faithful wife, a beautiful son growing day by day, nothing that he could possibly desire on this earth wanting to fill the cup of happiness up to the brim; he did reject that cup, he rejected that earthly happiness and parted from his truest one not out of hardness of heart, but because he wanted a more permanent association and to share the whole of happiness, which he knew there was to be had by a man who would search through and through and who would die for it. If it is a glorious thing to scale the heights of Mount Everest and to sacrifice precious lives in order to be able to go there and make some slight observations — I deliberately call them slight, compared to this, — if it is a glorious thing to give

up life after life in planting a flag in the uppermost extreme points of the world, the North and the South Poles, much more glorious is it to give not one life, to surrender not a million lives, but a billion in search for that imperishable truth. So I say to the Christian young men and others — I know that this association has a majority of members who are Christians and so I thought I could not better appreciate your great kindliness in inviting me here to-day than to deliver the important message exclusively to the Christians — and therefore I will say to the Ceylonese young men, do not be lifted off your feet, do not throw away the simplicity of your ancestors. I will tell that a time is coming when those who are to-day in their mad rush multiplying their wants and thinking that thereby they will add to the real substance, add to the real knowledge of the world, and also because they are sincerely inviting the whole world to share those pleasures which they call or miscall treasures ; a time is coming when they will themselves retrace their steps and say, " Oh, what have we done ? " Civilisations have come and gone. Where is Babylon and where is Assyria ? Where are all those beautiful buildings which the historians tell us they had erected ? Even in India they have made researches in Sind, they have excavated some beautiful buildings and they say our forefathers built those beautiful things just like they have in the streets of London. I am not the only man questioning these things. The great Wallace, the contemporary of Darwin, said the same thing. He said that after fifty years of brilliant inventions and discoveries of science, we have not added one inch to the moral height of mankind. So said a dreamer and a visionary, Tolstoy, who gave his life to that search ; so said also, as I consider, Jesus. So said Buddha — that he found his duty and so said Mohammed, the great Prophet, whose religion is to-day being defiled in my own country and falsified. He counted all these treasures of the earth as naught and so, I say to the young men, by all means drink in deep the fountains that are there given in the " Sermon on the Mount, " but then you will have to take up sackcloth and ashes. This advice was meant not only for the disciples, but also for you and me. You dare not serve God and Mammon, and what is going on before you is after all multiple editions of the cinematograph. Mammon is living in our midst, taking the name of God in vain. God embraces everything. He is compassionate. He is Rahiman. He is all-merciful, He is Truth. He is tolerance incarnate, and therefore He allows also to have his nine days' wonder. So you, young men, will be true to yourselves if free

from that living but self-destroying and destructive show of Mammon. May God bless you to understand the spirit of the message that I have given you from the deepest recesses of my heart.

# La Prière

par SUZANNE DE DIETRICH.

Nous n'entendons pas tenter ici une définition, encore moins une apologie de la prière. Semblable tentative dépasserait de beaucoup les cadres d'un article. Nous voudrions simplement considérer la prière en tant que fait, et que fait essentiel de la vie religieuse.

Le christianisme occidental du vingtième siècle, tout au moins sous ses formes protestantes, nous semble caractérisé par une fièvre d'activité où la dépense d'énergie, qui est considérable, apparaît singulièrement hors de proportion avec l'effet spirituel produit. A quoi tient cette inefficacité ? Ne serait-ce pas que nous avons perdu le secret de la véritable concentration spirituelle, hors de laquelle toute action n'est qu'agitation vaine ?...

L'action est le grand fétiche moderne ; elle est recherchée pour elle-même et l'on pourrait dire de beaucoup d'hommes et d'encore plus de femmes qu'ils se réfugient dans l'action comme Pascal accusait ses contemporains de se jeter dans le divertissement, à seules fins de se fuir et faute de « savoir demeurer en repos dans une chambre ». Cette fièvre d'action entraîne dans son orbite la prière elle-même : celle-ci nous est fréquemment présentée comme « le levier de l'action » ; Dieu joue le rôle de protecteur de nos entreprises ; son intervention toute-puissante apparaît aux âmes simples comme un des facteurs de la réussite. Et le psychologue, plus subtil mais non moins utilitaire, voit dans la prière une mise en œuvre féconde d'énergies subconscientes. Dans l'un et l'autre cas la prière cesse d'avoir sa fin en elle-même ; elle est rabaisée à l'état de moyen et utilisée pour des fins humaines.

Une telle conception de la prière en profane l'essence et ne tarde point d'ailleurs à en tarir les sources. L'incompréhension dont témoignent beaucoup de libres-penseurs, et notamment beaucoup de jeunes, à l'égard de la prière ne provient-elle pas en partie d'une vue caricaturale de la prière qui tend à la présenter comme une perpétuelle requête, Dieu n'ayant, semble-t-il, d'autre fonction en ce monde que de satisfaire les fins particulières des hommes qui s'adressent à lui ? Etrange conception de la divinité ! Combien plus religieuse, si c'était là l'authentique prière chrétienne, l'attitude du musulman prosterné dans la



poussière, dans une soumission inconditionnelle à la volonté toute puissante d'Allah !

Nous ne nions certes point que la demande n'ait sa place dans la vie de prière véritable, et nous aurons l'occasion d'y revenir. Mais la prière chrétienne, comme tout acte de culte véritable, a sa fin non en l'homme mais en Dieu. Elle est dans son essence, un acte d'adoration et d'offrande, le tribut d'amour que l'âme croyante apporte à son Dieu ; son but ultime n'est point la satisfaction de nos désirs humains, ni même notre salut, mais la gloire divine. Elle ne vise pas tant l'exaucement de l'homme que, si j'ose dire, l'exaucement de Dieu : « Que ton Nom soit sanctifié, Que Ton Règne vienne, Que Ta Volonté soit faite »... Dieu : Dieu cherché, aimé, voulu, servi pour Lui-même, telle est la fin de toute prière authentique ; hors de cette attitude, nous ne cherchons, aimons et voulons que nous-mêmes et, en réalité, nous ne prions plus, — ou nous ne prions que nous-mêmes.

La religion chrétienne est un mystère d'amour : « Dieu a tant aimé le monde qu'il a donné son Fils unique, afin que quiconque croit en lui ne périsse point mais qu'il ait la vie éternelle ». Par la prière, le croyant entre dans ce mystère d'amour ; il en fait l'objet de ses méditations, de sa contemplation, de ses actions de grâces ; il prend conscience des trésors de grâces, de pardon et de force que Dieu lui communique en Jésus-Christ ; il se donne à son tour ; il s'associe aux fins que Dieu poursuit dans le monde ; il adhère à cette Volonté qui le cherche et le veut. Il ne s'agit plus ici ni d'exaucer le caprice de l'homme ni de se soumettre avec résignation à des décrets immuables. Dieu apparaît comme le Grand Vivant qui fait œuvre de vie et associe sa créature à son œuvre. « Vous êtes collaborateurs de Dieu » ; mot hardi, mot fou de toute la sublime folie du christianisme : l'amour infini s'abaissant jusqu'à solliciter l'adhésion de sa créature, jusqu'à ne rien vouloir lui arracher par la contrainte, jusqu'à ne rien pouvoir en elle et par elle qu'avec son libre consentement.

Dans cette « métaphysique de la générosité »<sup>1</sup> la prière apparaît comme le facteur non seulement fécond mais indispensable de la réalisation des fins divines. Elle initie l'âme aux desseins de Dieu, à ce qu'il se propose en elle et par elle ; par elle l'âme est admise « dans le conseil de Dieu ».<sup>2</sup>

Il est donc dans toute prière comme un double mouvement, de l'âme vers Dieu et de Dieu dans l'âme ; l'âme offre ses louanges,

<sup>1</sup> Le mot est du Père Laberthonnière.

<sup>2</sup> Calvin.

ses actions de grâces, elle s'offre elle-même « en sacrifice vivant et saint », et Dieu en retour se révèle à elle, l'initie progressivement aux mystères de la vie spirituelle, à son plan rédempteur ; étant une relation d'amour, la prière chrétienne n'est pas complète si elle n'implique un don de part et d'autre : à la consécration de l'homme correspond la grâce efficace de Dieu, en telle sorte qu'elles s'engendrent l'une l'autre et collaborent de façon indissoluble et mystérieuse, et que l'on peut dire tout à la fois que les grâces que nous recevons sont la réponse de Dieu à nos efforts de fidélité, et que notre prière elle-même est déjà une grâce, impossible sans une action préalable de Dieu...

Dieu offre à l'âme qui le cherche deux moyens essentiels de le connaître : la contemplation assidue de Jésus-Christ et l'assistance de l'Esprit. Si notre propos était de faire un exposé dogmatique de la prière, nous nous plairions à souligner ici combien dans toute prière chrétienne la réalité de la Trinité devient en quelque sorte tangible. C'est à Dieu, notre Père, que monte notre prière ; c'est à Lui que va l'hommage de notre obéissance, c'est de Lui que procède « tout don parfait », mais Jésus-Christ y apparaît à la fois comme objet de notre contemplation — car où contemplerions-nous Dieu sinon en Jésus-Christ ? comment prendrions-nous conscience de notre vocation d'homme sinon en Jésus-Christ ? — et comme indispensable médiateur ; et notre prière n'atteint son but, ne trouve, si je puis ainsi parler, sa formule, la ferveur de désir nécessaire à son exaucement, que par l'assistance du Saint-Esprit qui, selon le mot de St-Paul, dicte lui-même à notre esprit ce que nous devons demander.

Abandonnée à elle-même, notre prière tend à suivre la ligne de moindre résistance, c'est-à-dire la pente de nos préoccupations personnelles ; son champ de vision se rétrécit ; de théocentrique elle devient égocentrique ; d'universaliste elle devient individuelle ; que de fois ne nous sommes-nous pas crus humbles alors que nos humiliations mêmes n'étaient encore que subtile recherche de nous-mêmes ! désintéressés, alors que nous n'avions point pris soin de nous assurer que la cause embrassée par nous de toute la force de notre vouloir et de notre désir était bien celle de Dieu ! Pour soustraire notre prière aux impulsions du sentiment une discipline spirituelle est nécessaire ; la récitation des psaumes, l'usage des prières liturgiques peuvent être d'un grand secours ; l'oraison dominicale nous donne à jamais le cadre et le rythme de la prière chrétienne normale où la requête personnelle s'insère dans une solidarité consentie et voulue avec tous les hommes, et constitue en quelque sorte la mineure de l'oraison, la venue du

Règne, l'accomplissement de la volonté divine en restant la dominante. Mais c'est par-dessus tout dans la méditation (non discursive mais priée) de l'Evangile, dans l'évocation de la vie du Christ que la prière devra sans cesse s'alimenter.

Certains auteurs recommandent que l'âme s'exerce à contempler chaque jour quelque aspect de la figure du Christ ; ainsi peu à peu l'effigie du Maître se marque dans l'être du disciple ; celui-ci s'imprègne de sa présence : « nous tous qui, le visage découvert, contemplons comme dans un miroir la gloire du Seigneur, nous sommes transportés de gloire en gloire, comme par le Seigneur, l'Esprit ». L'âme qui contemple, s'objective ; elle s'initie à ce que Dieu est, à ce que Dieu veut. Et lorsqu'ensuite, son regard se reporte sur le monde qui l'entoure, et sur elle-même, elle parvient à juger les choses et les hommes non plus du point de vue de l'homme naturel mais du point de vue de Dieu. C'est sans doute de ce jugement purifié par la contemplation et la prière que Paul pouvait dire : « L'homme spirituel juge de tout et n'est jugé par personne<sup>1</sup> ».

Et l'âme ainsi dépouillée d'elle-même, docile aux inspirations de l'Esprit, sait que demander et peut demander avec assurance. Sa volonté s'étant unie à la volonté divine, un discernement nouveau lui est donné de ce que Dieu attend d'elle ; elle devient entre les mains de Dieu un instrument d'intercession ; antenne mystérieuse par laquelle les ondes de la grâce divine passent pour atteindre d'autres âmes en travail.

Certaines écoles activistes se plaisent volontiers à opposer le mystique et l'homme d'action ; en réalité les faits démentent

---

<sup>1</sup> Le « tiers-ordre protestant » des Veilleurs, fondé par le Past. Wilfred Monod propose à ses membres une discipline spirituelle comportant la récitation quotidienne des Béatitudes. Le Past. Bouttier dans un livre récemment paru : la *Semaine du Chrétien*, propose aux croyants une discipline de prière dans laquelle un aspect de la figure du Christ est proposé chaque jour à la contemplation du fidèle ; le rythme suggéré est le suivant : acte de présence, contemplation, adoration, acte de foi, louanges et intercession. Ces efforts et plus encore l'écho qu'ils éveillent chez les jeunes manifestent le besoin de restaurer dans la mystique protestante française, un élément d'adoration et de contemplation aussi bien que de discipline qui lui a trop souvent fait défaut.

Nous assistons au même moment, dans la littérature catholique, à une véritable floraison d'éditions ascétiques et mystiques de vies de saints, à une recrudescence de vocations contemplatives. Ainsi s'affirment, au moment même où notre civilisation matérialiste atteint son apogée, les besoins éternels de l'âme humaine, les exigences de la vie surnaturelle qui refuse de perdre ses droits.

cette opposition ; que l'on relise l'histoire des grands fondateurs d'ordre, celle des Réformateurs et dans les temps modernes celle d'un Blumhardt ou d'un Georges Muller. « L'amour du Christ nous presse », disait St-Paul ; l'authentique mysticisme chrétien ne saurait jamais dissocier l'amour pour Dieu de l'amour des hommes ; mais il sait qu'aimer les hommes en Dieu est le seul moyen de les aimer efficacement, c'est-à-dire d'un amour qui sauve ; il sait que l'âme qui prie acquiert de ce fait un discernement spirituel qui donne à son action une continuité, une sûreté qu'aucune sagesse humaine ne lui confèrera jamais ; il sait que dans une vie conduite par l'Esprit, une *vie priée*, rien n'est laissé au hasard, et que les actes les plus insignifiants en apparence s'y trouvent souvent avoir une portée providentielle prévue de Dieu seul...

Il sait enfin que par delà le monde des apparences il est des forces surnaturelles de vie et de mort qui s'affrontent ; que toute âme constitue un centre de vouloirs et de désirs, et participe par le simple fait qu'elle veut, qu'elle aime à ces mystérieux combats ; et qu'il appartient au croyant de combattre dans l'invisible, avec les armes surnaturelles de l'Esprit, les combats de Dieu contre les puissances de ténèbres ; que si tout combat de l'esprit demande à être préparé par la prière, il est des domaines où la prière seule est efficace, des résistances qu'elle seule peut vaincre, et qu'enfin les victoires de Dieu ne se préparent, ne se consomment et ne portent tous leurs fruits que dans et par l'Esprit.

Ainsi la prière n'est point simplement une préparation à l'action ; ni un acte entre beaucoup d'autres ; elle est l'acte par excellence de la vie religieuse, celui par lequel l'âme agit de Dieu travaille à surnaturaliser le monde, préparant selon ses moyens le jour où « Dieu sera tout en tous », où la prière sacerdotale du Christ trouvera son accomplissement.



### Summary

Our purpose here is to consider prayer as a fact of the religious life. Is not the inefficacy of our twentieth-century Christianity due to the fact that we have forgotten how to pray? The feverish activity of our age has affected even our conception of prayer; we tend to see in it a means of harnessing God's power to the service of our personal aims and needs or of turning to account our own subconscious forces. We think of prayer too crudely, as a perpetual petitioning of God; the true end of prayer is not man but God, not the satisfaction of human desires, but the Divine Glory.

Through prayer the believer enters into the mystery of Christian love, he joins himself in spirit to the purposes which God is pursuing in the world, he enters into association with the Divine Will, he becomes a fellow-worker with God. In all true prayer there is a two-fold movement — of the soul towards God, and of God towards the soul; it is a relation of love, and therefore of mutual giving, the consecration of man and the Grace of God. In fact, our prayers are at once a means and an effect of Grace.

In all Christian prayer, the reality of the Trinity becomes in some sort tangible; — our two chief means of knowing God are the contemplation of Jesus Christ and the help of the Holy Spirit. In order to pray aright, a spiritual discipline is necessary. Left to itself, our prayer becomes too narrowly personal, egocentric rather than deocentric. The recitation of the psalms or of liturgical prayers may help in this respect. But the greatest help is to be found in prayerful meditation of the Gospel and the life of Christ. By the daily contemplation of the person of Christ we arrive at a knowledge of God, and learn to see and judge the things of this life as it were through God's eyes.<sup>1</sup> The soul thus united in will to God gains a new perception; it becomes an instrument in God's hands, by which the Divine Grace may pass to others.

There is no real division between the mystic and the man of action, as may be seen in the lives of great religious leaders and reformers. The love of God cannot be divorced from the love of men; the habit of prayer gives a spiritual discernment and certainty which are all-important in the conduct of practical life. Beyond the world of appearances the supernatural forces of good and evil meet in a mystical conflict, in which every living soul is involved; through prayer we throw our whole spiritual energy into the fight, and there are cases in which it is the only effective weapon.

Prayer then is not merely a preparation for activity, nor a form of activity; it is the supreme act of the religious life, by which the soul, filled with God's presence, works for the triumph of the supernatural in the world.

---

<sup>1</sup> The members of the Protestant "Third Order", the Watchers' founded by M. Wilfred Monod, practise the daily recitation of the Beatitudes as a spiritual discipline. M. Bouttier in a recent book suggests the centering of our daily worship on one aspect of the person of Christ. These tendencies towards a greater mystical emphasis in French Protestantism have found considerable response amongst the younger generation; in Catholic circles the profusion of mystical works and the revival of contemplative vocations shows the same movement of reaction against our materialist civilisation.

# What the "Quaker Spirit" has Meant for Germany.

A Study in " Practical Christianity. "

By EMIL FUCHS.

*(Translated from the German)*

In 1918 the German people found itself isolated, surrounded by nations which felt it their duty to keep it powerless, since it was Germany which, in their eyes, was responsible for the war. There was a brief flicker of hope after the Revolution ; Wilson's fourteen points would be the foundation for the peace conditions. Then came the cruel disappointment — a peace based entirely on the short-sighted interests and will to power of the victors.

It was true then — such was the conclusion arrived at by millions — the spirit of force ruled the world, and for Germany there was only one hope — to become strong again, and win back her freedom in war. A wild flame of hatred ran through the country, not only against the foreign oppressor but still more against those in Germany itself who stood for peace and reconciliation. Rathenau fell a victim to this hatred, born of despair, and countless numbers amongst the people suffered bitterly under its effects.

## The Triumph Over Hate.

And then people's attention began to be more and more drawn to the work of a few quiet men and women. They came from the nations whom we regarded as our implacable foes, and brought food to our starving children ; gradually we began to look to them for help, and when we were faced with a case of peculiar distress, and had no help to give, then we turned to the Quakers, who were always ready to offer us their untiring goodwill, the advice of experienced men and women, their connections all over the world.

Confronted by their efforts, hatred died away. Here was the living proof that the " enemy " peoples were not merely hostile, that the power of conscience was alive amongst them and was

working to fashion the world anew according to its laws. The work of the Quakers shook many prejudices, and many were forced by it to examine more deeply the question of hate and force. And perhaps the greatest gain of all was that those of us in Germany who believed in peace, justice, the power of conscience amongst all peoples, and wished to base our views and our policy on this belief, found in this work the strengthening factor which we so much needed in the terrible loneliness in which we found ourselves.

There were times when for many of us the silent worship of the Quaker meeting was the only expression of fellowship, the only sign that the belief in the coming of God's Kingdom, and the duty of preparing for it, was still accepted by many people in all lands. It had an extraordinary effect upon us, in the midst of the wild surge of hate, to be there with men and women from England, America, France, Holland, and to be conscious of the fellowship which binds together members of all the warring races in response to the appeal of the Divine Love.

The work of the Quakers in Germany was a deciding element in the fact that in those days courage did not entirely die out in Germany, that the effort to create peace and understanding went on, and that to-day the overwhelming majority of the German people are free from the spirit of hate and solid for the policy of peace.

### The Sense of Social Responsibility.

For Germany, the war had meant a terrible time of hunger ; after the war the blockade and the inflation period prolonged this time of suffering for countless numbers. But at the same time the war and the inflation gave to speculators and profiteers the possibility of a much more rapid increase in wealth. And whilst one section of the people in terrible misery saw their children pining away before their eyes, another section lived in foolish and ostentatious luxury and extravagance. And whilst the German profiteer and the German speculator were giving vent to their patriotism in tirades and the stirring up of hate against the enemy, the " Friends " came, messengers from the " enemy " peoples, Quakers from England and America, and organised the feeding of the children and assistance to the " new poor, " those living on invested money, who had suddenly been plunged from comfort into bitterest poverty and helplessness. It was a

striking example of the responsibility of men for their fellows, which was so terribly lacking at that time in the German people, deeply shaken as it was by the war and the revolution. Or rather, there was no central point round which it could concentrate and develop into an active force.

This central point was provided by the work of the Quakers, at the moment of our deepest despondency, a point to which all could look and towards which all could turn who were conscious of this responsibility for their fellow men and wished to work in that spirit. From this focal point proceeded a force that aroused men's consciences and combatted the wild spirit of despair that fights only for itself, forgetful of others. The Quakers showed us clearly how terrible a thing it is when members of the same nation live forgetful of each other, some enjoying comfort and happiness, whilst others are plunged in misery together with their families. The work of the Quakers was one of the forces most instrumental in arousing and stimulating in the German people that sense of responsibility, then endangered and decaying, without which no people can live, still less recover from such a state of ruin and disorganisation as then prevailed.

### **Towards International Understanding.**

And this same Quaker spirit found courage not merely to send its messengers to us in our unhappy state, but to remind us of our duties towards others. At once it brought us together with men and women of those nationalities between whom and ourselves the barrier was highest — the French, the Poles, etc. It seemed a bold thing to do, it seemed almost impossible, and yet it was the right path to follow, to appeal to our full sense of responsibility, to point out to the Germans that they, in virtue of their position in the centre of Europe, in virtue of their difficult situation itself, were called to a great work of reconciliation and peace. And the Quakers, as they brought the peoples of the different nations into personal contact, and told the Germans about France and the French about Germany, began also to try to arouse an understanding for the rights of the scattered minorities. How much have not the Quakers contributed to the understanding and respect shown towards the German minority in Poland, and towards the small fragment of the Polish and Danish peoples still to be found in Germany.



And if a new spirit of understanding is coming into being, the work of the Quakers has had a large share in creating it; those small conferences of fifteen, twenty, thirty people of different nationalities, held on the frontiers, unnoticed, unobtrusive, helped to start the movement which is now becoming more and more definitely embodied in great plans for international understanding and has attained the dimensions of a political force.

### **The Appeal to the Workers.**

The Church, Christianity itself, have for centuries in Germany been dominated by a one-sided state idea. The Church and Christianity were looked upon as forces which supported the State; they worked in favour of the existing social order. The existing balance of power within the State, the existing subordination of those who served to the rulers and the possessing class, the " spirit of the subject " proper to a monarchist State, military obedience and authority, were sacred in the eyes of the Church and of Christianity, as elsewhere. The result was that the classes which suffered under the oppression of the existing social order, and above all, the masses of the workers, grew embittered not only against the social order itself and the State and the prevailing distribution of power, but also against the Church, against Christianity and against religion. In Germany atheism and materialism spread through the masses as forces of liberation from a creed which seemed to imply subjection to the State and the ruling classes and exploitation of labour. Men had grown entirely deaf to the divine challenge to love for man, respect for human dignity, justice. The highest point of this tendency was reached when the Church allowed itself to glide unprotestingly with the rest of the country into the war, neither saying nor feeling that to do so was a sin against the command of God. The result of all this was that it was at that time impossible in Germany to speak of Christianity or religion to a gathering of workers without raising a storm of hatred and abuse.

Then came the Quakers, with their work of love, the strong sense of responsibility for others which made itself felt in their activities, the fact that these men and women had not adopted the war mentality, that they stood boldly out against the post-war spirit of hate. The Quaker feeding campaign, all that the Quakers did, became in the eyes of the masses worthy of love and respect. In it they came once more into contact with a spirit that felt itself responsible to God for all its actions, for its

fellow-men, for the acts and policy of its people. It became possible once more to speak in popular assemblies of Christianity and religion with the certainty of being listened to, especially if one began by telling of the work of the Quakers, and why they did it. That work undoubtedly contributed much to the reawakening, amongst the masses of the German workers, of an interest in Christian thought and piety; it became clear to men that the Church, official Christianity, were not religion. Religion is something different. Confined at first to small circles, the movement towards religious socialism began to develop, and is winning an ever-increasing importance in the whole German Labour Movement.

### **The Quakers and the Future of Germany.**

The Quakers as such form only a small circle in Germany, but round them and in contact with them is the larger circle of those who, engaged in the most varied forms of activity, are able to pass on to wider spheres what they have received from the Quaker spirit. But these two circles are not what matters most. They were bound to remain small in numbers, for the dislocated Germany of to-day has vast and countless problems to solve, and these demand from her citizens all their strength and skill, so that they have neither time nor force for other effort. But the important point is that, when men and women in Germany to-day strive to grapple with these pressing problems they come upon the effects of the work of the Quakers. What Germany received at their hands lives on as a power, in her institutions, in the tasks with which she is confronted, in the practical endeavours which are being made to carry out those tasks. And wherever men and women in Germany to-day are struggling with the great and all-important problems of our people's future, they find themselves working in that spirit of responsibility for others, which came to conscious life in Germany in some sort in connection with the work of the Quakers. We do not yet know what conscious and individual form and expression this spirit will one day take. It is labouring and struggling with the tasks before it, and the form which it takes will be determined by this struggle. But whatever the form may be, it will always look back with gratitude and a sense of kinship to the spirit and essence of the work of the Quakers, which called it into life and strengthened it in the decisive hour of greatest suffering and distress.

# **The “ Christu-Kula-Ashram ”**

## **An Experiment in Christian Community Life.**

By E. FORRESTER-PATON.

### **The “ Ashram ” Idea.**

The idea of a community setting themselves apart for a life of religious worship, devotion, meditation, is found in some of the earliest traditions of religion in India. Men, impelled by the sense of God as the one enduring reality and by their longing to experience more of Him, withdrew from the distractions of common life (sometimes alone, sometimes with their families) and settled down in little groups far away in the forest or by some river side. Here they lived in the simplest possible way, devoting all their energies to the quest for God. Such hermitages were called ashrams. Some of these became noted as places where the peace and joy of the presence of God could be ‘ felt,’ and so, attracted to them by this fact and by the fame of some saintly religious teacher or ‘ Guru,’ young men would leave their homes to spend several years as the disciples of the guru, who would live and move with them in closest intimacy treating them as his own children, and sharing with them his knowledge and religious experience. So the ‘ Guru-Kula ’ or ‘ Family of the Guru ’ arose.

There has been a recent movement in India to revive this ancient ideal and adapt it to more modern needs. Many must have heard of “ Shantineketan,” Dr. Tagore’s ashram, and of Mr. Gandhi’s ashram at Sabaramati. Recently several groups of Christians also have been trying to glorify Christ by starting such ashrams, and of these our little group at Tirupattur, which we call “ Christu-Kula-Ashram ” (Family-of-Christ Ashram) is one.

The actual beginning of this ashram was made only seven years ago, but the thoughts which inspired it grew up from a friendship formed in 1915 between Dr. Jesudason and myself (I being but a medical student at the time) and we also look forward to its growing, and to other groups being formed out of similar friendships. One of us had found much inspiration from the life of St. Francis of Assisi, and for the other there was the longing to identify himself with the people to whom he felt called

to commend the gospel of Christ. But it was something far deeper than merely a similarity of ideals which drew us together as friends, and that, we feel, was the love of Christ.

### **The Basis of the Experiment.**

The basis for our life as a community we conceived under three heads :

First, faith in, and devotion to Jesus Christ. It is our purpose to live a life of dependence on God as revealed in Him, and to let Him work out His purposes in and through us. In Him there is neither East nor West, and so we seek that members of different nationalities, cultures and communities in their common devotion to Him may be united in our group. In this way, in a world torn asunder by racial animosities, we strive to witness that Christ is the one in whom all may be brought together. Thus the joyful co-operation in the service of the Kingdom of those of different races and nationalities on the basis of friendship in Jesus Christ, is the first ideal which we have been seeking to work out in the life of the Ashram. As a corollary to this came the sense of the tragedy of all the denominational differences among the servants of the Kingdom. We have experienced the extraordinary oneness and fellowship in spiritual things that exists among men seeking after God, quite independent of their particular profession or creed. Therefore we ask for no creedal test, but only that those with us may share in a common devotion to our one Lord, and in serving Him. We also realise that the "Inner light" illumines many honest souls that have not named the name of Christ, and such also we welcome to come and share in following the Light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.

### **A Fellowship of Intercession.**

Our worship is very simple, and usually includes some period of silent waiting upon God. We also realise that variety is necessary to suit different temperaments. Thus in the early morning at 5 a.m. we meet and sing together one or more Indian chants of adoration and aspiration. Then, after a short silence and the Lord's Prayer, we separate for the morning period of individual study, meditation and prayer, during which time we all try to help one another by observing silence. Then before morning



food we have a time of united devotional study of the Bible. At midday we are called together again from our various activities for a short time of united intercession, as a guide to which different general topics are chosen for each day of the week. We also observe evening " Sandhya " — that is, the time between the setting of the sun and the appearing of the stars, set apart for individual meditation and worship. Often as we sit alone in the cool of the evening, watching the splendours of the sunset and the deepening tints on hill and cloud, all nature seems to move us to praise and adoration ; and when, at times, we have been disturbed by the strivings and turmoil of the day, God speaks His word of peace in our hearts. Then, at night, before we separate for rest, we have a hymn and parting prayer together. So far concerning the devotional side of our life.

### **A Sharing of Life and Service.**

Love one to another we take as the second guiding principle of our common life. Often it is far easier to love those whom we seek to serve than just joyfully to bear and share with our comrades in the daily round, and grow at the same time in mutual love and understanding ; and for lack of this very thing how many great and noble undertakings have been marred ! This growing love, we felt, must spring from a growing experience of that wonderful suffering love of Christ which is forgiving us so much. We seek to express our unity and love by sharing in common our worldly goods, and by our common meals together, and by our willingness to help one another in every possible way.

Many have been coming to share with us in the life and work for a period, whose family or other circumstances, however, made it impossible for them to adopt this as a permanent way of life ; we call them " volunteers. " It is upon these that our little group has been largely dependent, and it is by them (most of them young men) that the greater part of the service has been carried on, and the family life been enriched. Whilst they are with us they share all the life and activities of the family, which on its part makes all necessary provision for them according to our simple way of life.

### **The " Rule " of the Ashram.**

Those who desire to become permanent members are expected to stay with us for a preliminary period of three years, so that

we may be able to grow in friendship and understanding of one another, and that they may find out whether the Ashram life is God's call for them. At present it is only Dr. Jesudason and I who have definitely committed ourselves to the Ashram as a life work. As permanent members, we give up all private property, in whatever way seems best to each (i.e. to relatives or to any others who may require help, or to the Ashram itself, all money so received being put into the common fund); and also we agree to remain unmarried. These are not steps to be lightly undertaken, but we felt that they are necessary for the fullest and deepest growth of the Christu-Kula life in the Ashram.

We have also been greatly cheered by many visitors, who have helped us in various ways. Many young men also have come to us during their school or college vacation, either to assist us in the activities of the Ashram, or to receive inspiration for their future usefulness in life.

The common fund above referred to is also replenished from freewill offerings from those specially interested in the Ashram (but we seek to avoid any advertising for funds); also from thank-offerings from patients, and to a certain extent from the produce of our agricultural work. This fund meets all our household expenses, as well as the cost of buildings, and the equipment and running expenses of the hospital, school, and any other forms of service we undertake. We have had no difficulties so far through lack of funds.

A simple way of life in dress and food comes almost naturally, and especially so as we are living in the midst of villagers, whose simplicity of living (two very meagre meals a day is all that most of them can afford) is out of dire necessity. Our common meals (for which we all sit down on the floor and eat with our fingers in simple Indian style) are often times of much good-humoured laughter and fun; and how much a keen sense of humour does to help us on in life! We had hoped in the beginning to do without paid servants altogether, and we still hope that some brothers may come who will feel it their call to do the cooking, or the washing of the clothes or even the scavenging (as, by the way, they do in Mr. Gandhi's Ashram); but up to now we have been obliged to have paid servants for these duties.

### **A Service of Love.**

Love to one another is intimately bound up with the service of our neighbours (the villagers) which we take to be the third

leading motive for our lives. To Jesus we look to learn that spontaneous, self-forgetting and truly humble service, and that love which sees and understands the heart-aches of others, and can meet their deepest need. And it is through such service that we feel we can best commend His love to others.

Being both medical men we have a fairly well-equipped hospital with about 28 beds. In tending the sick, those who have a very simple training and even such as have none at all, can co-operate with those who are medically qualified; the one essential thing being the "feeling heart." Often those engaged in the simpler tasks of cleaning wards or attending to the needs and comforts of patients or dressing their wounds, can by their individual love and care bear a more effective witness than the doctors. Undertaken in this spirit, the most menial task becomes honourable and can be done with joy. In order to work out this ideal we have often had to carry on the healing work without any thoroughly trained assistance, as we feel there is something greater than mere "efficiency." It is an essential part of our healing work to tell the patients and their friends of the hope which we have in Christ and of *His* power to heal and save, and we also, on occasion, pray with them individually and especially before surgical operations. Every evening we meet for prayer with, and on behalf of, the in-patients, when we also tell them the story of Christ; but it is the individual talks which have been most helpful in influencing some of them. We have also seen how wonderfully patients have recovered as a result of prayer in spite of our inability to do much for them.

The agricultural work had to be developed (though so far we have had no agricultural expert) owing to the urgent need occasioned by the poverty and unemployment of the villagers around us. It is often hunger and low vitality that make our medical work doubly difficult. So we have a farm, with two good wells sunk by the labour of the villagers themselves, and this provides work for at least some of our poor neighbours. Every morning we have a service for them with a short address, before they begin their field work.

### Seeking the True Approach to India.

A school was started for the poor children of the neighbourhood three years ago, since when it has progressed considerably. The medium of instruction is Tamil — their own mother tongue.

Our aim is to make this a vocational school, and already weaving has been introduced and also agriculture. We have in addition a small orphanage, the children living in the ashram in a little cottage called "Balya Veedu" (Children's Home).

We have been earnestly seeking to express our life and service in this Ashram in a way that will make Christianity more intelligible to the people of India, where, for so long, a deeply foreign tinge has been given to it, both in the churches and in the lives of the Christians. We have also been trying to bring about a home and a fellowship into which men called of God from other lands can come to India, not in the patronising attitude of teachers and leaders, but in humility seeking to learn and to serve along with Indian brothers, as well as to impart to others what they have been taught of God. We wait in faith that He who has begun this will also make it grow in conformity with His will.



## Book Reviews.

REALITY. *B.H. Streeter. Macmillan 8s. 6d.*

The welcome which has been accorded to Canon Streeter's book, both by the reviewers, and by the more thoughtful section of the reading public generally, leaves little doubt that the attempt which he has made to find "a new conotation of science and religion" has met a widely felt need. His success in doing so is probably due in no small measure to the frank and intimate way in which he has taken his readers into his confidence in the introduction which lays bare the motive underlying the writing of the book.

In it he describes his search for an intellectual basis for his own religious faith, since to him, as to many others in this generation, "religion in its mystical, emotional or practical expression was... of little value, if divorced from intellectual integrity." The following chapters set forth "the position in which my own mind has found rest after thirty years of search."

Unlike most of the older books on apologetics, this is not a "defence of Christianity." It does not ask the question "Is Christianity true?" but sets out to investigate the nature of the universe in which we find ourselves, which presents to us so many questions speculative and practical. In this examination of the phenomena presented by life itself, the evidence of religion as a factor in human history, and of the life of Christ as a factor in religion, are found to be peculiarly significant. We thus come round from an investigation of the questions which any adequate view of the nature of reality must help us to answer, to the investigation of the Christian view as satisfying that test.

The enquiry naturally starts from the interpretation of reality which has exercised so powerful an influence in English thought since the middle of last century — the materialistic, and increasingly mechanistic standpoint of physical science. An acute examination of this view reveals the fact that on the one hand it is being steadily undermined by the more searching analysis of its own internal development, while on the other it is discredited by its failure to do justice to the other and equally significant method of interpreting reality, the method of art and religion, which may be described as qualitative in distinction to the essentially quantitative method of science.

From this there emerges a theory of knowledge to which, in

its fully elaborated form, Canon Streeter would be inclined to give the name of Bi-Representationism, the theory that the true nature of reality can only be apprehended in so far as we approach it armed with both methods of interpretation, the scientific, which gives us "the Baedeker's guide map" of Venice, and the artistic-religious, which gives us "the Turner painting" of the same.

Having thus indicated the validity of the qualitative interpretation, the author proceeds to ask whether we are justified in seeing in the life-principle, without which even the mechanistic system of the universe remains dead and inoperative, that same source of vitality which religion, by an anthropomorphic personification, which is at least as legitimate as the mechanomorphism of science, discovers to us as God.

The argument of these earlier chapters is valuable, especially for a generation which is inclined to accept the alleged conclusions of physical science as verbally inspired. But it is in two later chapters on "The Christ" and "The Defeat of Evil" that in our judgment the book reaches its high watermark. The former of these increases in those who know the solid basis of scholarship which he has laid in *The Four Gospels*, the desire that Canon Streeter should some day embark upon the task of writing a Life of Christ. Alike in the estimate of what constitutes the uniqueness of his character, and in the "symbolic" interpretation of doctrine, which finds in that character "the haunting quality of seeming to be the expression of something universal, the mirror of the Infinite," there is material here which might well be expanded into a great piece of work.

The second of these two chapters, "The Defeat of Evil" is as sound and valuable a treatment of the two problems of evil and suffering as can be found anywhere in such short compass. Its wholesome refusal to be drawn into the false sentimentalism which springs from an identification of evil and suffering, gives it a strength and sanity which are refreshing. And at the same time its unmistakable basis in a personal experience of conflict, and a valiant overcoming of it, prevent the treatment from ever becoming coldly abstract.

For those who are embarking upon a study of the searching questions set forth in the questionnaire prepared for the India meeting of the Federation Committee, *Reality* can well be recommended as providing a real contribution to their thought.

F.A.C.

DOES CIVILIZATION NEED RELIGION. *By Reinhold Niebuhr, Macmillan, pp. 242, \$ 2.00.*

It is an intoxicating experience to come upon an interpretation of religious truth that convinces one by its own intrinsic merit as being an authentic word for his generation. I confess to such intoxication on reading Reinhold Niebuhr's "Does Civilization Need Religion." Dr. Niebuhr is an American. He writes against the background of American industrial society out of his experience as a pastor for twelve years in the city of Detroit. His primary interest is in estimating the survival value of religion and the resources of religion in the presence of that type of civilization. But the issues with which Dr. Niebuhr deals are not peculiar to America nor even to the Anglo-Saxon world. They are issues which confront the Christian Community in every Protestant land where industrialism has become the dominant force in shaping the course of civilization.

More important than the appearance of "Does Civilization Need Religion" is the fact of Reinhold Niebuhr. He represents something new in the religious life of America. His outlook cannot be stamped either "fundamentalist" or "modernist." He does not fit any of the current labels that have been applied by the rest of the world to American theology or lack of theology. He is as new in the spiritual firmament of the United States as Karl Barth has been in the spiritual firmament of Germany. There is some outward resemblance between these two men — their youth, their love of paradox, the rapier sharpness of their minds, their moral passion. All this can probably be explained by their common racial inheritance. But the similarity does not seem to extend much further. To Barth's "There is no way from man to God, but there is a way from God to man" Niebuhr might reply "If there is a way from God to man there must also be a way from man to God." But whereas Barth's supreme interest is in theological restatement, Niebuhr's supreme interest is in ethical recovery. He applies himself to discover the conditions under which religion can operate redemptively in modern society and concludes that the first condition is that religion itself should recover its ethical sincerity and intelligence.

Niebuhr looks out on the Protestant world and finds the Christian Community religiously impotent before the forces of civilization. This impotence is due to the fact that the Reformation left the individual with a keen conscience about his personal affairs and with a strategy for saving his own soul but with little

conscience for society and with no strategy for redeeming the individual in his social relationships. This fatal weakness was further confirmed by the sentimentalism of the 18th century and the individualism of the 19th century. In the presence of a developed industrial society such a religion is oblivious of its primary tasks, and lingers on as a soothing spiritual retreat for the respectable middle classes, whom it supplies with a rational justification for their faith but with no moral dynamic or strategy to make their faith socially effective. In the midst of an impersonal civilization true religion stands as the one guarantee of personality. To save personality threatened by such a civilization religion needs a metaphysic which guards the concept of personality in the universe, but such a metaphysic will be of little use "if the moral fruits which issue from its affirmations and experiences do not actually qualify the brute struggle of life, so largely determined by natural forces."

As opposed to the monistic and even pantheistic trends in the Western churches Niebuhr asserts the necessity of adhering to a provisional dualism in which God is recognised as at work upon the natural order but without being identified with the natural order or lost in it. In such a dualism religious values themselves are seen to be relative.

But how are the resources of religion to become socially effective? At this point Niebuhr has much in common with Julien Benda. The latter indicts the intellectuals for identifying themselves with particularistic interests. The former makes the same charge against the religious leaders. They both regard "detachment" as the only hope for recovering discredited positions. Niebuhr sees that the forces of religion must make a strategic retreat from the world in order to be able to deal more effectively with the world. He suggests that a new asceticism will be necessary to give religion the moral authority required to deal with the avarice and pride characteristic of modern civilization, but he makes it perfectly plain that he is not thinking of either "puritan or monastic asceticism." "The new asceticism must be in the world but not of the world," and those who practise it must learn to combine sentiment with intellectual acumen, to be at the same time idealists and realists, as wise as serpents and as harmless as doves. It is only so that ethical integrity can be restored to religion, and that the values of religion which are essentially extra-rational can be conserved to furnish dynamic to moral effort.

This is in brief Reinhold Niebuhr's thesis. His analysis of



the *malaise* of contemporary Protestantism represents brilliant scholarship as well as profound spiritual insight. Though indebted to both Weber and Tawney, his own intimate experience of Protestantism, as it lives and thrives in a great metropolis, is obviously the main source of his material.

Dr. Niebuhr has just accepted a chair at Union Theological Seminary, New York. This will provide him with an exceptional opportunity to continue his work as a maker of the "New Reformation". He has a great responsibility, but there is every reason to believe that he will be equal to it.

F.P.M.

LE MYSTÈRE DE JÉSUS. Par P.L. Couchoud. F. Rieder et C<sup>ie</sup>, Paris.  
1 vol., 117 pp.

Il y a cinq ou six ans une série d'articles sur le sujet de ce livre parus dans le « *Mercure de France* » avait provoqué une vaste discussion théologique, exégétique et historique dans les plus grandes revues de France. Celui qui avait déclenché le mouvement, le D<sup>r</sup> P.L. Couchoud créa peu de temps après, aux Editions Rieder, une série intitulée « Christianisme » qui compte déjà une vingtaine de volumes dus, en partie, aux tenants de la critique la plus radicale du Nouveau Testament.

La thèse de notre auteur est qu'il faut choisir entre le christianisme, religion de l'histoire, et Jésus l'Homme-Dieu. Les allier l'une à l'autre, c'est rendre le premier impensable, du moins — et le D<sup>r</sup> Couchoud le reconnaît loyalement — à ceux qui n'ont pas la foi. Il les estime nombreux sur la terre et il leur destine le fruit de ses réflexions et de ses recherches. Les articles du *Mercure de France* amendés, corrigés, amplifiés forment la deuxième partie du volume dont nous nous occupons ici. La première est vouée à l'examen critique des témoignages historiques : Pline, Tacite, Suétone, l'Evangile de Marc, l'apôtre Paul, et des ouvrages de Renan et d'Alfred Loisy. L'Evangile de Marc, pour le D<sup>r</sup> Couchoud, est un tissu de passages de l'Ancien Testament et des conceptions de saint Paul. Ce dernier est le véritable créateur du Christ et du christianisme. Par l'évocation des prophètes de l'Ancien Testament et de ses visions personnelles, l'apôtre Paul fait du Christ — figure céleste — une réalité à la portée des hommes. Rien dans les lettres de saint Paul ne peut donner valeur d'histoire à la personnalité humaine de Jésus.

Il est impossible d'indiquer ici tous les arguments du D<sup>r</sup> Couchoud contre l'historicité de Jésus. Sa thèse a été combattue par

de nombreux auteurs catholiques et protestants. Parmi les derniers, le professeur M. Goguel, de Paris, en se plaçant uniquement sur le terrain de l'histoire, a fourni la réfutation définitive des conceptions du Dr. Couchoud, dans son livre remarquable : *Jésus de Nazareth. Mythe ou histoire?* (Payot, Paris). Sommairement résumés voici les arguments de M. Goguel : le silence de Flavius Josèphe, l'historien juif, sur Jésus et le christianisme, est dû à son désir de flatter les Romains ; les adversaires du christianisme du deuxième au quatrième siècle n'auraient eu garde de négliger une arme aussi formidable que celle de la non-existence de Jésus, ils se plaçant au contraire sur le terrain des Evangiles ; les docètes n'auraient pas dépensé des trésors d'ingéniosité pour justifier leurs théories, ils sont donc comme les témoins de la tradition évangélique. Saint Paul lui-même en persécutant les chrétiens, avant sa conversion, nous donne la certitude de la mort de Jésus. L'ouvrage de M. Goguel, ainsi que celui du Dr Couchoud, ont été traduits en anglais.

La théologie, l'exégèse et l'histoire évangélique, sont en train de prendre une magnifique revanche en France, grâce aux travaux d'un Jésuite, le R.P. Marcel Jousse, sur la psychologie du langage, travaux qui ont fait l'admiration du professeur Alfred Loisy qui revient, dit-on, de beaucoup de ses négations de jadis.

A.S.

THE LIFE OF JESUS. By J. Middleton Murry. Jonathan Cape, pp. 317. Price 10/6.

This book was written, Mr. Murry says, to make Jesus wholly real to himself. "The Jesus who is presented in these pages is simply the Jesus who is real to me." He explains with entire candour what his convictions about Jesus are. "I cannot share the belief (in the divinity of Jesus) because I do not know what it means." Yet Jesus was more than a genius. "To the creative imagination was added in him the power to live and die for his vision of things to come.... To the wisdom of the perfect teacher was added the love of the perfect brother... Indeed I do not know what predicates of supreme humanity could be denied him." So unique was he that "either Jesus was God made man or he was man made God." Mr. Murry is persuaded that the latter is the truth. This truth is best expressed in the language of Jesus' experience at his baptism ; there he knew himself to be "Son of God." God had long waited for the man who would pass beyond the other voices, and listening to the inmost secret, would recognise Him as Love. Jesus discovered this secret.

But though Jesus was the only son, because the only one who knew the truth of God, all men might equally become sons of God if they would. "Jesus believed himself to be the Son of God in precisely the same sense as he believed all men to be sons of God." To know this meant a complete rebirth. To be reborn was to enter God's Kingdom. When this was realised "a new order of consciousness would begin as different from that which men now have, as human life and human consciousness is different from animal life and animal consciousness." And this inner change would change also the outer world; man's whole environment would become a new thing when man was reborn. Thus Jesus was the first-born of the sons of God.

The purpose of his ministry was to lead other men to this knowledge and rebirth. But his generation proved too blind; "he found no brother." He soon learnt that it was as a worker of miracles, not as the bearer of this gospel, that the world would follow him. The religious leaders for their part believed that the days of inspiration were passed; they therefore rejected "the voice of God speaking directly to a man" for "the voice of God graven immutably on stone." Authority, feeling itself menaced, declared that he was possessed by the Spirit of Evil. So the stage was set for the great tragedy.

Up to now Jesus did not believe himself to be Messiah. Like John, he was waiting for the Son of Man from heaven. It was out of the long waiting in vain and the uniqueness of his knowledge of sonship that the new conviction was born. Peter's confession at Caesarea "revealed Jesus to himself." He was the Son of Man. But the Son of Man was a supernatural being and a judge. Therefore Jesus must first put off his human nature. Man had refused the Kingdom. Jesus would "pluck it down from heaven for men." He would go to Jerusalem to die as on God's altar. But his reply to the High Priest shows that he believed that in the very moment of death he would be transformed and ascend to the right hand of God, to return as Messiah.

To force the issue Jesus had only to let the secret of his claim to Messiahship be betrayed. In order to control the time and manner of his death, he arranged deliberately that Judas should betray the secret to the priests when he was ready. The event took place as he foresaw. But he was not "translated" from the cross, and he died with a cry of despair. But that was not the end. "To history belongs the reality of Simon's experience of the continued existence of Jesus." It was really the experience of an objective presence, though not of a physical body.

So the writer "looks like a man on the man Jesus. He will stand our scrutiny. Keep our heads as high as we can, they shall be bowed at the last."

Mr. Murry states his case so frankly that it would be superfluous to criticise it from the point of view of the more fully Christian experience and belief. His knowledge of history, too, is not equal to his imaginative power. He seems hardly to appreciate, for example, the intense social solidarity that led the Jews practically to identify the nation and its representative, which might have suggested another interpretation of why Jesus was baptised; or the fact that outside the gospel records there is only one known Jewish writing in which Daniel's Son of Man is identified with the Messiah. The result is that his interpretations are sometimes too fanciful to be convincing. But there is no denying the quality of Mr. Murry's insight; it touches little that it does not illuminate. When all has been said, this book will stand as a sincere and beautiful tribute from a writer of genius to the Master of men.

P.I.P.

JESUS OF NAZARETH : HIS TIMES, HIS LIFE AND HIS TEACHING.  
*By Joseph Klausner. Translated from the original Hebrew by Canon Herbert Danby. The Macmillan Company, New York, 434 pp. \$4.50.*

To say the least of it, this is an intensely interesting book. It is interesting because of its origin and its contents. Dr. Klausner is a distinguished Zionist scholar and leader, a Ph. D. of Heidelberg, and is now resident in Jerusalem. The book was not intended for Christian readers, but is an attempt to estimate the significance of the Founder of Christianity for the Jewish people, in the light of the author's researches into contemporary Jewish history and literature. The volume contains a wealth of material drawn from Rabinnical and other sources which has hitherto not been readily available and undoubtedly throws valuable light upon the Jewish intellectual and historical environment in which our Lord lived and worked. The book was composed in modern Hebrew and has been admirably translated by Canon Danby, who is much too apologetic about his own work.

The author declares that his object in writing is to show how Judaism differs and remains distinct from Christianity, and that he has made every effort to keep within the realm of pure scholarship, avoiding subjective religious and nationalist aims. "There has never yet been in Hebrew any book on Jesus the Jew which



had not either a Christian propagandist aim — to bring Jews to Christianity, or a Jewish religious aim, — to render Christianity obnoxious to Jews." Certainly the book as a whole is characterised not only by a scholarly outlook but by impartiality. It could not be described in any sense as seeking "to render Christianity obnoxious." But while Dr. Klauser no doubt never consciously departed from his objective attitude, there are occasions when he dogmatically lays down conclusions for which the evidence is lacking or palpably inadequate. Like too many Christian scholars, he is rather over-ready to eliminate from the Gospels passages which do not chime with his own point of view, even though there may be no adequate textual or other reasons for this course (e.g. pp. 332, 336, 348, 352, etc., etc.). He is apt to dismiss statements as "lacking in Mark and therefore unhistorical" (p. 294); an entirely uncritical attitude. He declares that Jesus could not have used the words "let him deny himself and take up the cross", because he lived in Galilee and the Roman practice of crucifixion was not in force there (p. 302), while earlier he has told of thousands of Jews being crucified a few years before this near Jerusalem (p. 157). Does he really maintain that Jesus could never have heard of crucifixion in Galilee? He builds up an elaborate chain of reasoning, taking for granted all kinds of things, and then declares that Judas Escariot *must* have argued in this way (p. 325). It is, of course, part of the interest of the book that it bristles with statements about which one wants to argue!

Part of the trouble, if one may venture to say so, is that Dr. Klauser's acquaintance with Christian scholarship is not as thorough as his remarkable rabinnical knowledge. In particular, he makes no reference to any British or American scholars, — except to one American, not of the first rank, who is quoted in a French translation. This may account for his misunderstanding of the position of representative Christian scholarship about many of the questions he discusses.

These criticisms relate mainly to the later part of the book. Nearly all of the first half contains a very valuable discussion of the sources of our knowledge of the life of Jesus, and the political, economic and religious conditions of the period. The treatment of the historical accuracy of the Gospels, which he rates very highly, is of considerable interest.

It is not possible in a brief review to discuss any of the numerous questions raised. In spite of all criticism, we welcome this volume warmly, not only as a very learned and valuable

work within the limits of its author's special knowledge, but also as being a fair-minded and honest attempt to study the place of Jesus in Judaism. Dr. Klauser's conclusions in many respects cannot be shared by the Christian, but the book is one which will repay close reading. It will take its place at once as probably the most valuable book on the Jewish sources and setting of the life of our Lord, replacing, for example, Wersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*.

H.M.

"THE GOSPEL THAT JESUS PREACHED," by *A.T. Cadoux*.  
*Published by George Allen and Unwin, Ltd., London, pp. 244 6/6d.*

This is a valuable book that every student of theology should study and one that the layman can read with great profit. It is direct, clear and logical. Back of each argument one feels the influence of extensive study and sincere conviction. The number of questions raised and considered is startling, but in no way confusing. Each question is succinct and is treated with foresight as to the criticisms of the modern mind, whether from the point of view of theology, philosophy, psychology or science.

After considering the inefficiency of the traditional gospel as largely due to the decline of the belief in eternal punishment, Dr. Cadoux briefly considers the Gospel that Jesus preached and the Gospel of the Early Church, as presented in the various books of the New Testament.

It is in the last three chapters, entitled "Experience," "Validity" and "Theological" that one finds on every page thought stimulus for the problems which always concern thoughtful people. Such problems as reality, goodness, divinity, moral-consciousness, value, purpose, sin, suffering and forgiveness are considered.

In contrast to the complications into which the mind of man can wander is the simplicity of the Gospel of Jesus for to-day. His Gospel is its own authority to the mind that understands; it is the truth about God in word and in deed. Jesus taught the truth about God, and was in his powerful and sinless personality the truth he taught.

This book will help clear the confused mind of its conflicts between modern thought and traditional theology, if it is read with tolerance, and it should lead to a belief in man, God, reality, and to a more vital understanding of the Cross of Jesus.

C.A.M.



## Notes on Contributors.

Dr. KARL BARTH is a former Swiss pastor who after the War went first to the University of Göttingen and is now at that of Münster. He is the leader of the most vital religious movement in modern Germany, and is described by Count Keyserling as having saved Protestantism for Northern Europe.

Professor BERDIAEFF is the author of "Le Nouveau Moyen Age" and one of the outstanding intellectuals among the Russian emigrés; he is an occasional lecturer at the Russian Orthodox Academy in Paris.

Mademoiselle SUZANNE DE DIETRICH is a member of the General Committee of the World's Student Christian Federation and has for some years been an important Secretary of the French Movement.

Dr. E. FORRESTER-PATON is a member of the Presbyterian Church and one of the founders of the "Christu-Kula-Ashram", in the North Arcot District, S. India. He is a fully-trained medical man.

Pfarrer EMIL FUCHS is a pastor in the Lutheran Church, a leader of the Religious Socialists in Germany and very well known for his sympathy with the cause of Labour.

Professor JULIO NAVARRO MONZO is a brilliant intellectual leader in South America, a former member of the General Committee of the World's Student Christian Federation, and a Secretary of the South American Federation of Young Men's Christian Associations, who has devoted himself specially to student work.

Mr. REINHOLD NIEBUHR, the author of "Does Civilisation Need Religion?" is a member of the staff of "Union Theological Seminary", U.S.A. and one of the editors of the "World To-Morrow".

Miss MAUDE PETRE is a member of an old English Catholic family, and has been in close touch with leading Catholic Modernists. She is the author of a "Life of Father Tyrrell" and many other books and articles on religious and social questions, including "The Ninth Lord Petre" recently published by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge "in the hope that it will contribute towards the cause of Christian Re-union."

Dr. W.B. SELBIE is Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, and a leader of the Congregational Church in Great Britain.

Professor PAUL TILlich is teaching at the Technical High School in Dresden.